Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

PUBLIC LAW 45--82nd CONGRESS

Chapter 121--1st Session

H. R. 3587

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 45 1

Index and Summary of H. R. 3587 2

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951: Includes the following items: Forest development roads and trails, $3,300,000; CCC administrative-expense limitation, increase of $2,750,000; expenses of defense production (for all executive agencies), $27,331,895, with a provision that "transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporations as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realine its regular programs"; Tongass forest highways, Alaska, $3,500,000; international information and educational activities; State Department, $9,533,939; surveys and school construction in critical defense areas, $50,000,000; Bureau of Employees' Compensation fund, $3,000,000; reactivation of industrial plants for strategic and critical materials, provision to make available $12,000,000 additional; provision that GSA appropriations for 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and improvements to public buildings under GSA control; engineering and economic investigations for Niagara River remedial works, $450,000, to be transferred from Army flood-control funds; international children's welfare work under the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, $5,750,000; Federal Civil Defense Administration, various items; various judgments and claims items; provision to prohibit assistance to countries which ship military commodities in contravention of U. S. Security Council policy and with the general provision prohibiting employment of members of organizations which assert the right of Federal Employees to strike against the Government.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 3587

March 7, 1951	Hearings: House, Part 1
March 14, 1951	Hearings: House, Part 2
April 6, 1951	Mr. Cannon, from the Committee on Appropriations submitted the House Report No. 298 on House bill H. R. 3587. Print of bill as reported.
April 9, 1951	House began debate on H. R. 3587
April 10, 1951	House concluded debate and passed H. R. 3587 with amendments.
April 11, 1951	H. R. 3587 referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of bill as referred.
April 17, 1951	H. R. 3587 returned to House for correction of error.
April 30, 1951	Senate reported H. R. 3587 with amendments. Senate Report 302. Print of bill as reported.
May 7, 1951	H. R. 3587 made unfinished business.
May 8, 1951	Senate began debate on H. R. 3587
May 9, 1951	Senate continued debate
May 10, 1951	Senate concluded debate on H. R. 3587 and passed bill with amendments. Print of bill as passed in the Senate. Senate conferees appointed.
May 14, 1951	House conferees appointed.
May 17, 1951	Additional conferee appointed by the House.
May 18, 1951	Conference Report submitted. House Report 484.
May 21, 1951	Both Houses agreed to conference report.
June 2, 1951	Approved--Public Law 45.

82D CONGRESS 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT No. 298

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

APRIL 6, 1951.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3587]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The estimates upon which the bill is based are contained in House Document Nos. 47, 57, 67, 68, 69, 74, 75, 81, 82, 83, 84, 95 and 99. The bill is divided into chapters corresponding to the subcommittees considering the estimates. The recommendations contained in the bill are a result of deliberations of the several subcommittees as approved by the full committee.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Budget estimates considered by the committee total $843,463,579. Appropriations recommended total $478,586,368, a reduction of $364,877,211. These amounts are distributed by chapters of the bill in the following table:

Chapter	Agency	Budget estimate	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimate
I	District of Columbia	*$1,172,740*	*$1,122,740*	*−$50,000*
II	Legislative	293,500	293,500	
III	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	113,929,384	23,839,323	−90,090,061
IV	Treasury-Post Office	169,080,000	160,980,000	−8,100,000
V	Labor-Federal Security	3,000,000	3,000,000	
VI	Agriculture	7,521,150	3,000,000	−4,521,150
VII	Interior	8,503,000	7,652,000	−851,000
VIII	Independent Offices	72,637,500	47,622,500	−25,015,000
IX	Civil Functions	Language	450,000	+450,000
X	Foreign Aid	12,500,000	5,000,000	−7,500,000
XI	Defense Agencies	454,000,000	224,750,000	−229,250,000
XII	Claims and Judgments	1,999,045	1,999,045	
	Total	$843,463,579	$478,586,368	−$364,877,211

CHAPTER I

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOE B. BATES, Kentucky, *Chairman*

SIDNEY, R. YATES, Illinois
FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts
LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon
EARL WILSON, Indiana

District of Columbia

The committee received estimates contained in House Documents 47 and 67 in the amount of $1,172,740 and recommends $1,122,740. The estimate of $50,000 for Day Care Centers has not been approved. Such centers are in conflict with the regular programs of the Board of Public Welfare. The responsibility of caring for dependent children beyond the scope of these programs is not the responsibility of the District government.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (OUT OF DISTRICT REVENUES, NOT INCLUDED IN TABULATION OF TOTALS)

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
67	Office of Corporation Counsel	*$5,000*	*$5,000*	
67	Collectors Office, 1949	*653,568*	*653,568*	
67	Collectors Office, 1951	*144,700*	*144,700*	
67	United States Courts, 1950	*265,443*	*265,443*	
	PUBLIC WELFARE			
47	Day Care Centers	*50,000*		*−$50,000*
67	St. Elizabeths Hospital, 1949	*13,704*	*13,704*	
67	St. Elizabeths Hospital, 1950	*22,604*	*22,604*	
	Total, Public Welfare	*86,308*	*36,308*	*−50,000*
67	Claims and Suits	*7,493*	*7,493*	
67	Judgments	*5,580*	*5,580*	
67	Audited Claims	*4,648*	*4,648*	
	Total, District of Columbia (Chapter I)	*$1,172,740*	*$1,122,740*	*−$50,000*

CHAPTER II

SUBCOMMITTEE

CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, New York, *Chairman*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
WALT HORAN, Washington
FRED E. BUSBEY, Illinois

Legislative Branch

The bill includes a total of $293,500 as supplemental funds for 1951 for several items under the Senate, House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, mainly for minor improvement and replacement work, and including final contract liquidation cash for remodeling the roofs and chambers of the House and Senate.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE			
75 and —	Stationery (revolving fund)	$1, 000	$1, 000	
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS			
	Capitol Buildings:			
82	House and Senate Improvements (roof and Chamber)	268, 000	268, 000	
82	Capitol Buildings	3, 000	3, 000	
99	House Office Buildings	21, 500	21, 500	
	Total, Architect of the Capitol	292, 500	292, 500	
	Total, Legislative Branch (Chapter II)	293, 500	293, 500	

NOTE.—Item of $17,878 in H. Doc. 82, pertaining to the Senate, not included above. Item has been left for determination by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, *Chairman*

DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
KARL STEFAN, Nebraska
CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio
GERALD R. FORD Jr., Michigan [1]

Department of State

International Information and Educational Activities.—In the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951", $41,288,000, the full amount of the budget request at that time, was allowed for "Establishment of radio facilities". It was then represented that this amount plus $3,399,184 previously provided, would be sufficient to complete construction of seven certain radio construction projects designated as ABLE, BAKER, EAST, DOG, CAST, JOHN, and JADE. The present supplemental budget request in the amount $97,500,000 includes the sum of $9,533,939 represented to the Committee as being required to meet price and cost increases to complete these facilities. The remainder of the requested $97,500,000 (plus $1,000,000 previously placed in reserve under sec. 1214) was asked for construction of 13 additional radio facilities.

Testimony before the Committee indicated that lack of proper planning, poor management, and avoidable delays in the execution of plans and contracts have been considerable factors occasioning the necessity of the request for over $9.5 millions additional for the above projects for which $44,687,184 in appropriations have already been made.

The testimony also indicated that all of the sites for the requested 13 new and additional facilities for which $88,966,061 was requested, have not as yet been selected. In fact, the Committee was informed that no definite determinations have yet been made as to the countries in which some of these proposed facilities would be located. It was further testified that a number of these planned facilities might be located on ships, although, on questioning, the Committee was given only vague and incomplete estimates of the number and the costs of such facilities as compared with land installations. Field tests of the transmitters proposed for the planned facilities have not as yet been made. Such tests are now scheduled to be made this month. The material submitted to the Committee in support of the estimate lacked definiteness and was so devoid of specific data that it could not be considered a plan of action.

The so-called Voice of America has received the support of this Committee since its inception. The Committee fully believes in a strong, effective Voice of America. It feels that there is a great need for combatting the insidious propaganda emanating from the Kremlin

[1] Temporarily assigned.

by making the truth available to those behind the Iron Curtain and to mankind the world over. It wholeheartedly believes that, properly managed and directed, the Voice of America is the best medium for accomplishment of a campaign of truth that has yet been conceived. However, the Committee must say that it is very much disappointed in the accomplishments and progress made to date. Mismanagement and poor planning with regard both to the engineering and to the administrative phases of the program have cost valuable time as well as dollars.

In view of the foregoing facts, the Committee is including only the amount $9,533,939 in this bill to permit completion of the seven projects previously authorized and for which considerable sums have already been expended or obligated. It hopes that the Department will exert every effort to complete these projects at the earliest possible date, take the necessary steps to overcome the weaknesses set forth in this report, and return to the Congress as soon as possible with a more intelligent and better planned program.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Flood, has requested a statement herein that he favors allowance of the full $97,500,000 budget estimate.

American Sections, International Commissions.—The Committee approves the budget request to transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to International Organizations" the amount of $36,500 for this item. Of this amount, $35,000 is for payment to the Corps of Engineers and $1,500 to the Federal Power Commission for investigations to determine the proper design and cost of remedial works on the Niagara River in accordance with the treaty with Canada ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

General Services Administration

Department of State Building, New York, N. Y.—The request for the additional sum of $1,470,000 to acquire and remodel a building in New York City for the use of the United States information and educational program is disallowed. Testimony from both the Department of State and the General Services Administration was to the effect that they no longer deemed it advisable to purchase or acquire the New York Furniture Exchange Building upon which this request was based. When a suitable building is located which can be purchased or acquired and firm figures are available, the committee will receive further testimony in regard to this matter.

Department of Justice

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities.—The Committee considered a budget estimate in the amount of $160,000 of which $100,000 was for the Lands Division in connection with acquiring over 690,000 acres of land for the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission, and $60,000 for the Claims Division in connection with the cost of printing the record in the Texas City disaster litigation. The committee recommends an appropriation of

$30,000 for this item and approves the use for these purposes by the Department of $100,000 from funds heretofore appropriated for other divisions in General legal activities. This will provide $60,000 for printing the record in the Texas City litigation and $70,000 for the Lands Division.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Salaries and Expenses.—The bill includes the additional sum of $6,147,000 for this important Bureau. Of this amount $2,616,158 is to enable the Bureau to continue on a six day week through the balance of fiscal year 1951. This will supplement an allocation of $1,275,000 from the appropriation "Emergencies (national defense)" which has already been made to finance the continuance of a six day week pending approval of this supplemental appropriation by the Congress. $1,360,781 is to provide 1,260 additional F. B. I. agents and 1,373 additional clerks and technicians in order that the Bureau may discharge its responsibilities under the accelerated and expanded internal security program. The Budget request contemplated the purchase of 945 additional automobiles. The committee has approved 700, which it believes will be sufficient for the 1,260 additional agents provided. Consequently the requested equipment funds have been reduced by $400,000. This reduction should in no way hamper the effective operations of the Bureau at this time.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Prisons.—The 1951 regular appropriation was based on an average inmate population in Federal prisons of 17,000. The Budget request for $149,000 was based on an average inmate population of 17,700. Currently the prison population is averaging slightly less than the anticipated 17,700. The additional sum of $125,000, a reduction of $24,000, from the budget estimate, is therefore recommended.

Support of United States Prisoners.—The additional sum of $139,000 is included in the bill for payment to state and local jails for the support of Federal prisoners while in their custody. The number of such prisoners in state and local jails is greater than had been anticipated at the time the regular bill was considered.

Buildings and Facilities.—The full amount of the budget estimate, $1,380,000, is recommended for replacement of the power and heating plant of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia. $170,000 in cash and $700,000 in contract authority was previously allowed for the new heating facilities. The Committee was advised that it is not economically practicable to secure power either from the Altoona project or by purchase from the Georgia Power Company. It was estimated that by producing its own power at this institution, the new generating equipment would be completely amortized and the government will realize savings in excess of $1,000,000 over a 30-year period. It was also testified that this institution is now heavily committed to supply urgently needed material and equipment in connection with the National defense.

Department of Commerce

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Claims, Federal Airport Act.—The bill includes $1,464,384 certified as necessary to settle claims covering 11 public airports pursuant to Section 17 of the Federal Airport Act as amended. Prior appropriations have been made for six groups of claims totaling $2,864,129. It is estimated that there are approximately 60 additional claims totaling $9,000,000. In order to expedite the disposition of pending claims and establish a termination date for the filing of claims, the committee has included language providing that no request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952, of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and Expenses.—The Committee recommends the sum of $25,000 for studies by the Civil Aeronautics Board looking toward the early separation of subsidy payments from compensatory mail payments to air lines.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Budget estimate of $450,000, for "Salaries and Expenses, Departmental," composed of $30,000 for increased pay for wage board employees and $420,000 for the purchase of chart paper, is approved. Requirements of the Defense Department for charts have increased substantially. The Committee was advised that the price of chart paper has increased 105 percent since the beginning of the fiscal year. The bill also contains $70,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, Field," the full amount of the budget request.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Tongass Forest Highways, Alaska.—The full amount of the Budget estimate of $3,500,000 is included for surveys, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. It was testified that these road improvements are essential to the establishment of pulp plants at Ketchikan, Juneau, and Sitka.

Public Lands Highways.—The full amount of the budget estimate, $750,000, is included in the bill for liquidation of obligations already incurred pursuant to the contractual authority granted by section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

The Judiciary

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

Fees of Commissioners.—The bill includes $25,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 1950 for payment of fees earned by United States Commissioners during that year.

Fees of Jurors.—The Committee recommends an additional amount of $200,000 for this item. While the budget estimate was in the amount of $300,000, it now appears on the basis of testimony furnished the Committee that $200,000 plus the $2,700,000 approved by Congress in the regular act for fiscal year 1951 should be sufficient.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
67	American sections, International Commissions	(1)	(1)	
74	International information and educational activities	$97, 500, 000	$9, 533, 939	—$87, 966, 061
	Total, Department of State	97, 500, 000	9, 533, 939	—87, 966, 061
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
67	Department of State Building, New York, N. Y.	1, 470, 000		—1, 470, 000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
67	Legal activities and general administration: Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	160, 000	30, 000	—130, 000
67	Federal Bureau of Investigation, salaries and expenses	6, 547, 000	6, 147, 000	—400, 000
	Federal Prison System:			
67	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	149, 000	125, 000	—24, 000
67	Support of United States prisoners	139, 000	139, 000	
67	Buildings and facilities	1, 380, 000	1, 380, 000	
	Total, Department of Justice	8, 375, 000	7, 821, 000	—554, 000

	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
67	Civil Aeronautics Administration: Claims, Federal Airport Act	1, 464, 384	1, 464, 384	
67	Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses	25, 000	25, 000	
	Coast and Geodetic Survey:			
67	Salaries and expenses, departmental	450, 000	450, 000	
67	Salaries and expenses, field	70, 000	70, 000	
	Bureau of Public Roads:			
67	Tongass Forest highways, Alaska	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000	
67	Public lands highways	750, 000	750, 000	
	Total, Department of Commerce	6, 259, 384	6, 259, 384	
	THE JUDICIARY			
	Other courts and services:			
67	Fees of commissioners	25, 000	25, 000	
67	Fees of jurors	300, 000	200, 000	−100, 000
	Total, the Judiciary	325, 000	225, 000	−100, 000
	Total State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary (Chapter III)	113, 929, 384	23, 839, 323	−90, 090, 061

[1] $36,500, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Contributions to International Organizations."

CHAPTER IV

SUBCOMMITTEE

J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia, *Chairman*

ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico
OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey
GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey
EARL WILSON, Indiana
BENJAMIN F. JAMES, Pennsylvania

Treasury Department

BUREAU OF THE MINT

The Committee is recommending an additional appropriation of $130,000 for the Bureau of the Mint for fiscal year 1951, a reduction of $200,000 from the budget estimate. $47,300 of the amount recommended is to pay wage increases to unclassified employees approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, effective from the date of his approval.

The remaining amount, $82,700, has been approved for the production of additional coins. This increased production is necessary to meet an unprecedented demand from banks for additional coins which arose subsequent to the consideration of the regular 1951 budget program of the Bureau.

COAST GUARD

An additional appropriation of $1,000,000 is recommended in the bill for "Operating expenses" to enable the Coast Guard to prepare in advance for the operation of two additional ocean weather stations which it is required to operate from July 1, 1951, pursuant to plans approved by the Defense Establishment. One of the stations involves the Coast Guard taking over an operation now being conducted by the Navy; the other is for the establishment of a new and additional station.

The Committee is recommending an additional amount of $350,000 for "Acquisition, construction and improvements" to repair damage to Coast Guard installations along the North Atlantic coast caused by a severe storm last November. This is a reduction of $300,000 from the budget estimate and has been made because the Committee desires to have the Coast Guard absorb the balance of the cost of making these repairs from funds already appropriated and available under this heading.

The Committee feels that the Coast Guard should re-evaluate its construction program with the idea of deferring those projects which are not of sufficient urgency as to require completion prior to the completion of the necessary repairs of damage done by this storm.

Post Office Department

The Committee recommends an additional appropriation of $7,500,000, a reduction of $7,500,000 in the budget estimate, for "Postal operations" because of the increased volume of mail being handled by the Post Office Department. The Committee believes that the amount included in the bill, together with the sum of $1,793,000,000 already appropriated, will be adequate to enable the Department to meet its obligations in handling the mail for the remainder of the fiscal year 1951.

The Committee has allowed the request of $152,000,000 for "Transportation of mails" which is required by the Interstate Commerce Commission's order of December 4, 1950, providing a fixed settlement of $312,000,000 to be paid to the railroads for transportation of mail during the period February 19, 1947, through December 31, 1950. Since $160,000,000 has already been paid to the railroads under the temporary rate increase of 25 percent which was authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the additional amount of $152,000,000 is now required to complete payments.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT			
67	Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	$330, 000	$130, 000	−$200, 000
	Coast Guard:			
67	Operating expenses	1, 100, 000	1, 000, 000	−100, 000
67	Acquisition, construction, and improvements	650, 000	350, 000	−300, 000
	Total, Coast Guard	1, 750, 000	1, 350, 000	−400, 000
	Total, Treasury Department	2, 080, 000	1, 480, 000	−600, 000
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT			
	(Out of the postal revenues)			
67	Postal operations	15, 000, 000	7, 500, 000	−7, 500, 000
67	Transportation of mails	152, 000, 000	152, 000, 000	
67	Clerks, first- and second-class post offices, 1947	[1] *150, 000*	[1] *150, 000*	
67	Railroad transportation and mail messenger service, 1948	[2] *200, 000*	[2] *200, 000*	
	Total, Post Office Department	167, 000, 000	159, 500, 000	−7, 500, 000
	Total, Treasury-Post Office (Chapter IV)	169, 080, 000	160, 980, 000	−8, 100, 000

[1] To be derived by transfer from "Clerks, third-class offices, 1947."
[2] To be derived by transfer from "Domestic air mail service, 1948."

CHAPTER V

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia
CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, New York
WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana
GEORGE B. SCHWABE, Oklahoma
LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon
FRED E. BUSBEY, Illinois

Department of Labor

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

The bill includes $3,000,000, the budget estimate, additional to the $25,000,000 appropriated in the regular bill for 1951 for payment of claims under the Federal Employees Compensation Act. Full effects of the 1949 liberalizing amendments to the basic law could not be accurately forecast when the 1951 appropriation was under consideration. Cost experience under those amendments thus far in 1951, coupled with the increased volume of cases attendant upon the larger number of persons covered as compared with a year ago, shows conclusively that the original $25,000,000 will not cover accruing costs during the remainder of fiscal year 1951.

H. Rept. 298, 82-1——3

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION			
67	Employees' compensation fund, 1951	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	
	Total, Labor-Federal Security (Chapter V)	3,000,000	3,000,000	

CHAPTER VI

SUBCOMMITTEE

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi, *Chairman*

WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma
JOE B. BATES, Kentucky
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
WALT HORAN, Washington

Department of Agriculture

Control of forest pests: Forest Pest Control Act.—Information presented to the committee indicates that requirements for the balance of the fiscal year 1951 for this program are $1,045,000, $345,000 for control work on the Englemann spruce bark beetle in Colorado and $700,000 for the spruce budworm project in Oregon. House Document No. 67 proposes that these funds be obtained by the appropriation of an additional $370,000 and the release of $675,000 from the contingency fund provided for 1951.

The committee does not feel that additional appropriations for control of Englemann spruce bark beetle are justified in view of the present admission of the high cost of the program, particularly in relation to the value of the timber involved, and because it is doubtful that the project can ever be successfully completed. It is of the opinion that no further work should be done on this project.

The committee agrees with continuation of the spruce budworm project in view of the high timber values involved and the good prospects for successful completion at a reasonable cost and concurs in the proposal to release funds from the contingency fund.

Forest development roads and trails.—House Document No. 67 requests the appropriation of $5,000,000 for construction of timber access roads and $800,000 for the repair of damage caused by recent floods in Oregon, California, and Nevada.

The committee has felt for some time that most of the forest roads and trails should be constructed by private operators in connection with their logging operations in the National Forests. Testimony from several experts outside the Department confirms the committee's opinion on this matter. However, $2,500,000 is recommended herein for the construction of central roads deemed most essential. $500,000 is recommended for repair of damage.

Payments to States.—The Act of December 29, 1950, authorized the appropriation of $1,351,150 for payments to 15 States to compensate them for certain collections from grazing permittees withheld and used by the Forest Service for construction and maintenance of range improvements without authority of law.

House Document No. 67 proposes that these funds be appropriated during the 1951 fiscal year. In view of the need for further study on this item the committee has decided to take no action at this time.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses.—House Document No. 57 proposes a supplemental authorization of $3,850,000 to meet increased workload resulting from unusually large inventories of agricultural commodities and the large expansion required in the storage facilities program. While the committee recognizes the need for some additional funds for this purpose, it does not feel that it can recommend more than $2,750,000, in view of the decreased demands which will be made upon the Corporation in the future due to the change from surpluses to shortages in many agricultural commodities.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas.—A revision in the appropriation language for 1951 is proposed in House Document No. 67 to permit the use of funds in this appropriation for assistance to farmers in obtaining and making the best use of scarce materials and equipment needed to meet expanded production requirements. While the committee feels that this work is essential, it believes that it should be performed by employees paid from regular appropriations of the Department or funds transferred from defense activities, rather than by the diversion of funds as proposed.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
67	Control of forest pests: Forest Pest Control Act	$370, 000		−$370, 000
67	Forest Service:			
	Forest development roads and trails	5, 800, 000	$3, 000, 000	−2, 800, 000
	Payments to States	1, 351, 150		−1, 351, 150
57	Commodity Credit Corporation:			
	Administrative expenses	(3, 850, 000)	(2, 750, 000)	(−1, 100, 000)
	Total, Agriculture Department, (Chapter VI)	7, 521, 150	3, 000, 000	−4, 521, 150

CHAPTER VII

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio, *Chairman*

W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts
BEN F JENSEN, Iowa
IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania

Department of the Interior

Commission of Fine Arts.—A request for $3,000 was reduced by the committee to $2,000, in view of the fact that it is not likely that the sum requested will be available in time to pay the expenses contemplated.

Bureau of Indian Affairs.—An appropriation of $3,650,000 for Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, has been approved as requested. $3,500,000 of this sum is for the design, construction, and equipment of a hospital at Bethel, Alaska, to replace facilities destroyed by fire. $150,000 is provided to develop supplemental ground water urgently needed at the San Carlos irrigation project, Arizona.

Bureau of Mines.—An additional amount of $350,000 for Construction, Bureau of Mines, was requested but denied by the committee. These funds were sought to provide modifications and additions to a pilot plant at Laramie, Wyoming, for conducting research on the production of alumina from low-grade ores. Expenditures of this nature are not warranted in as much as the Bureau of Mines has more complete facilities for such research elsewhere.

National Park Service.—A provision was proposed to authorize expenditure of funds to acquire property for the George Washington Carver National Monument, Missouri. Use of the appropriation for the current fiscal year is approved for this purpose without such an additional provision, since the expenditure is expressly authorized by law. Although in accord with the plan to purchase this property, the Committee feels that no expenditures to rehabilitate or maintain this property should be made until after the current emergency has passed.

Territories and Island Possessions.—An appropriation of $4,500,000 was requested for Construction, Alaska Railroad, for replacing shop facilities recently destroyed by fire at Anchorage, Alaska. It is recognized that the facilities must be provided, but by consolidating the structures savings can be accomplished. Accordingly, $4,000,000 is recommended, and is to cover the entire project presented, including machinery and other items. Standard fireproofing precautions should be strictly observed in the new construction.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Agency	Estimate	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimate
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
67	Commission of Fine Arts: Salaries and expenses	$3, 000	$2, 000	−$1, 000
67	Bureau of Mines: Construction	350, 000		−350, 000
67	Territories and Island Possessions: Construction Alaska Railroad	4, 500, 000	4, 000, 000	−500, 000
84	Bureau of Indian Affairs	3, 650, 000	3, 650, 000	
	Total, Department of the Interior, (Chapter VII)	$8, 503, 000	$7, 652, 000	−$851, 000

CHAPTER VIII

SUBCOMMITTEE

ALBERT THOMAS, Texas, *Chairman*

ALBERT GORE, Tennessee
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois

JOHN PHILLIPS, California
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Annuities, Lighthouse Service Widows.—The committee considered a budget estimate of $219,500 for this purpose, based on payment of $50 per month to 389 widows who became eligible for annuities on September 1, 1950 under the provisions of the Act of August 19, 1950, Public Law 719. The estimate also provided for 100 additional prospective eligibles on a 5 months basis. During hearings on the estimate the committee was advised that definite information as to the number of eligibles for which funds would be required was not available. In view of the lack of an accurate up to date estimate the committee has effected a reduction of $15,000 in the budget estimate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Strategic and critical materials.—The bill includes the budget estimate increasing by $12,000,000 the amount available during the current fiscal year for plant reactivation. The recent Supplemental Appropriation Act provided $14,000,000 for this purpose, and the pending bill increases the authorization to $26,000,000. The increase is essential and follows a recent reappraisal of the situation which disclosed that more extensive work will be required at some properties, that construction costs have increased, and that it will be necessary to reactivate one additional plant.

Decentralization of Federal activities.—The committee has disallowed the Budget request of $20,000,000 for financing a program of decentralization of 19,000 positions covering the period to June 30, 1952. The proposal was presented as a means of helping to relieve the serious space problem existing in the District of Columbia and adjacent area due to the expanding defense program.

The question of decentralization, as well as dispersal, is now pending before the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress. It is the opinion of the committee that an appropriation should not be provided until an overall plan has been considered and basic legislation providing for a comprehensive program is enacted. The budget plan considered by the committee contains numerous legislative provisions for which authorization should be secured in the usual way before an appropriation is granted. Also, the plan is incomplete in

that information is not available as to where a majority of the 19,000 positions will be transferred. As presented to the committee, the activities selected, positions to be transferred, and locations tentatively selected, cover only 4,842 positions.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Compensation and pensions.—The bill includes the budget estimate of $26,618,000 for the payment of compensation and pensions. A recent estimate of funds available under this heading showed that the $2,154,995,606 available for the current year will be insufficient to meet requirements. The amount recommended ($26,618,000) will be needed to meet payments required by law during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Automobiles for disabled veterans.—The bill contains the budget estimate of $800,000 to provide automobiles for disabled veterans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950. The amount recommended will provide 500 veterans with automobiles. The applications of 239 veterans have already been approved and it is estimated that 261 additional applications will be approved during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Department of Commerce

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

Maritime training.—The bill includes the budget proposal increasing by $55,000 the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses under the heading "maritime training." This sum is required to continue in caretaker status until June 30, 1951, former training stations at St. Petersburg, Fla., and Pass Christian, Miss., for which no funds were provided in the 1951 appropriation.

Vessel operations revolving fund.—The increased demand for the shipment of supplies, materials and other items resulting from national defense and other programs has resulted in a need for reestablishment of a vessel operations function substantially similar to that carried on by the War Shipping Administration during World War II. The proposed program involves the operation of additional vessels for the Government by established private operators acting as general agents of the administration. Funds are also required for the activation and repair of approximately 100 vessels in the reserve fleet. After the program is in operation it will, in general, be self-supporting. However, it is essential that funds be provided as initial working capital. The committee considered an estimate of $25,000,000 for the foregoing purposes and has allowed a total of $20,000,000.

Approximately 1,900 vessels, principally of the Liberty type, have been sold to citizens and non-citizens under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. These vessels were sold for approximately one-fifth of the cost of replacement at present labor and material costs. The Maritime Administration, in the interest of national defense, may, at some later date, under authority of section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, find it necessary to requisition for title or use any vessels owned by citizens of the United States. The committee has included in the bill language which will limit the price

which can be paid by the Maritime Administration for such vessels which originally were purchased from the Government. The language applies the principles of section 802 of the 1936 act, which section deals specifically in that act with vessels for which construction-differential subsidies have been authorized by the Government. Generally, the proposed language will limit the payment to a present owner of an amount not in excess of the price paid to the United States for the original purchase of the vessel, depreciated at the rate of 5 percent per annum plus the depreciation cost of capital improvements made on such vessels subsequent to their sale by the United States.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES			
	Civil Service Commission:			
67	Annuities, Lighthouse Service widows	$219, 500	$204, 500	—$15, 000
	General Services Administration:			
67	Strategic and critical materials	(1)	(1)	
95	Decentralization of Federal activities	20, 000, 000	0	—20, 000, 000
	Veterans Administration:			
67	Compensation and pensions	26, 618, 000	26, 618, 000	
67	Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans	800, 000	800, 000	
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	Maritime Activities:			
83	Maritime training	(2)	(2)	
83	Vessel operations revolving fund	25, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	—5, 000, 000
	Total, Independent offices (Chapter VIII)	72, 637, 500	47, 622, 500	—25, 015, 000

[1] Amount heretofore authorized to be transferred to the appropriation "Operating expenses" for reactivation of industrial plants increased from "$14,000,000" to "$26,000,000."

[2] Limitation on administrative personal services increased from "2,477,000" to "$2,532,000."

CHAPTER IX

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina, *Chairman*

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri
LOUIS RABAUT, Michigan
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,[1] Ohio

GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Michigan

Corps of Engineers

Niagara Power Development.—The committee recommends the request contained in H. Doc. 67 for this item, transferring $450,000 to the Niagara Power Development from reserves in "Flood Control, general". This will enable the Corps of Engineers to integrate the study of projects for development and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950, with the current study of remedial measures and with the work now under way by the Province of Ontario in connection with development of additional power plants.

It is to be understood by the Corps of Engineers that the approval of this item does not commit the Congress to the approval of subsequent requests for appropriations for plans, surveys or construction for this project.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Civil government.—The committee recommends the estimate of $72,500 for "Civil government", to be derived by transfer from "Maintenance and operation." Due to court action it has become necessary to change the basic work week of Panama Canal policemen from 48 hours to 40 hours. The transfer makes funds available for the payment of the additional policemen required by the change.

[1] Temporarily assigned.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Agency	Estimate	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimate
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY			
	CIVIL FUNCTIONS			
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS			
67	Niagara Power Development	[1] *$450, 000*	$450, 000	+$450, 000
	THE PANAMA CANAL			
81	Civil Government	[2] *72, 500*	[2] *72, 500*	
	Total, Department of the Army (Chapter IX)		450, 000	+450, 000

[1] To be derived by transfer from "Flood control, general".
[2] To be derived by transfer from "Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal"

CHAPTER X

SUBCOMMITTEE

J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia, *Chairman*

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
JOE B. BATES, Kentucky
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

International Children's Fund.—The committee heard estimates in the amount of $12,500,000 contained in H. Doc. 81 and recommends $5,000,000. The estimate is based on a 72 percent contribution by the United States to the International Children's Emergency Fund. The committee has been dissatisfied with the operations of this fund and with the percentage of our contribution, a carry-over of arrangements provided for UNRRA activities. The "emergency" contemplated at the time of the initial authorization of this program has long since ceased to exist. Although the life of the emergency organization has been extended for another three years, it is testified that objectives of the original program have been altered. In the light of changed circumstances the committee feels that it can no longer continue approving funds on the basis of the original plan, and is approving $5,000,000 on the definite understanding that the ratio of the United States contribution be not in excess of 33 percent, which is the ratio being strived for in contributions to the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Agency	Estimate	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimate
	Funds appropriated to the President:			
67	International Children's Welfare Work	$12, 500, 000	$5, 000, 000	−$7, 500, 000

CHAPTER XI

SUBCOMMITTEE

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

ALBERT THOMAS, Tennessee
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
JAMIE WHITTEN, Mississippi
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island

JOHN TABER, New York
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin

Expenses of Defense Production

The amount of $38,000,000, a reduction of $13,000,000 in the budget estimate, is recommended for implementation of provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

On July 19, 1950, the President delivered his message on the emergency situation confronting this nation. Shortly thereafter the Congress included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, the amount of $30,000,000 for use in formulating plans and creating such temporary organizations as might be required to deal with our growing economic problems.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 became law on September 8, 1950, and the appropriation recommended in the accompanying bill is for expenses during the fourth quarter of the current fiscal year.

While three newly created and eight regular agencies of the Government are involved in the request, the Bureau of the Budget indicates that because of the rapidly changing character and requirements in the fields covered by these agencies it was very difficult to identify with accuracy the specific needs of these agencies, and therefore requested a lump-sum appropriation to the President.

The committee, in conformity with the request, is recommending a lump-sum appropriation, to be allocated substantially in accordance with the following tabulation:

Funds appropriated to the President

EXPENSES OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Agency	Budget request	Recommended for fourth quarter	Recommended amount to be derived by		Reduction in budget request
			Absorption	Appropriations	
Defense Production Administration	$950,000	$950,000	0	$950,000	0
National Production Authority	7,124,000	6,500,000	0	6,500,000	$624,000
Department of Commerce:					
Office of Field Service	2,400,000	1,000,000	$667,000	333,000	2,067,000
Office of the Secretary	118,000	0	0	0	118,000
Office of International Trade	80,000	0	0	0	80,000
Office of Transportation	94,000	50,000	32,000	18,000	76,000
Office of Technical Services	18,000	0	0	0	18,000
Industry Evaluation Board	36,000	0	0	0	36,000
Department of the Interior:					
Office of the Secretary	93,860	20,000	13,000	7,000	86,860
Defense Solid Fuels Administration	212,526	100,000	67,000	33,000	179,526
Defense Electric Power Administration	230,220	100,000	67,000	33,000	197,220
Defense Minerals Administration	530,000	500,000	334,000	166,000	364,000
Petroleum Administration for Defense	550,000	450,000	300,000	150,000	400,000
Defense Fuels Administration	183,394	30,000	20,000	10,000	173,394
Department of Agriculture:					
Production and Marketing Administration	1,275,000	500,000	334,000	166,000	1,109,000
Forest Service	82,500	0	0	0	82,500
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	40,000	0	0	0	40,000
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	30,000	0	0	0	30,000
Legal, informational and other departmental services	57,500	0	0	0	57,500
Defense Transport Administration	550,000	550,000	0	550,000	0
Economic Stabilization Agency:					
Office of the Administrator	150,000	150,000	0	150,000	0
Office of Price Stabilization	25,650,000	25,650,000	0	25,650,000	0
Wage Stabilization Board	3,200,000	2,200,000	0	2,200,000	1,000,000
Department of Labor:					
Office of Defense Manpower	53,000	50,000	0	50,000	3,000
Office of the Secretary	37,000	0	0	0	37,000
Bureau of Labor Standards	148,000	0	0	0	148,000
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	12,000	0	0	0	12,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship	208,000	200,000	0	200,000	8,000
Bureau of Employment Security	190,000	0	0	0	190,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics	82,000	0	0	0	82,000
Department of Justice	135,000	0	0	0	135,000
Federal Security Agency	1,068,000	0	0	0	1,068,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	312,000	0	0	0	312,000
General Services Administration	5,100,000	4,600,000	0	4,600,000	500,000
Total	51,000,000	43,600,000	1,834,000	41,766,000	9,234,000
Deduct unobligated balance				−3,766,000	+3,766,000
Grand total	51,000,000	43,600,000	1,834,000	38,000,000	13,000,000

It would appear to the committee that if the reasons for our embarking on a program of national defense as given by the President on several occasions are sound then they are sound for all segments of our government. This nation has been in an emergency since the end of the war, but all agencies of the government resumed business as usual, disregarding the varied and continued threats to our security.

Now comes the time, when everyone is asked to make some sacrifice in the interest of strengthening the nation. Individually, such sacrifices, principally of comfort and luxuries, will be gladly made. Collectively, however, these sacrifices are not assumed so readily. The executive branch, itself, is included in the latter category. All agencies it seems, are willing to assist in the defense effort provided they get additional funds and staff therefor and provided they can continue to carry on their regular activities. It appears to the committee

that being, as we have been, in an emergency situation for the past several years, much of the money now requested for national defense would have been unnecessary had these agencies themselves, during this period pointed their activities toward national defense instead of going all-out for a resumption of normal peacetime functions.

It is unrealistic and wholly unreasonable for anyone to assume that it takes 2,300,000 Federal civil employees to govern us during a normal emergency, and then when a greater emphasis is placed on the security of the country and on the development of its capacity to defend itself a new army of specialists must be recruited to perform the added task.

One way for Russia to accomplish its objectives without spending a ruble is to allow us to spend ourselves poor—poorer than we now are. Our economy can withstand only so much borrowing, and that maximum is not too far away.

Our Federal Government, already too large, should not be permitted to grow larger, often on the pretext of having some connection with national defense. Such additional employees as are directly needed for national defense are to be transferred to defense activities, together with such funds as have been heretofore appropriated for their salaries and expenses.

The tabulation included above is, for the most part, self-explanatory. However, a word in further explanation might be helpful.

For the new defense agencies, generally, allocations requested are being recommended. Such reductions as have been made are based on practical aspects of personnel recruitment and space. While the full request for the Defense Production Administration is included in the recommended amount, the committee wishes to point out some possibility of duplication of effort between this agency and the National Production Authority and, to some extent, other agencies involved in loan and tax amortization activities. Furthermore, it would appear that the Defense Production Administration, as such, must develop a more realistic organizational structure and clarity of purpose if it is to succeed in its administration of this important program.

In those instances where no amount is recommended for the fourth quarter, the agency is expected to realign its regular work to meet the accelerated defense needs.

The estimated unobligated balance as of March 31 of $3,766,000 is to be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget in order to provide the recommended amounts for appropriations.

Language is contained in the bill, which makes provision for such transfers from regular activities of each department and agency as may be required to carry out national defense activities assigned to that department or agency. The committee expects that, in preparing estimates for fiscal year 1952 for activities under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, or other defense activities, the Bureau of the Budget will instruct all departments and agencies of the Government to adhere to the policy recommended herein of absorbing the costs of such activities, or of otherwise contributing to defense efforts.

EXPANSION OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY AND SUPPLY

The amount of $1,000,000,000 requested in the form of a public debt transaction, to supplement the $600,000,000 provided in the enabling act is recommended. This authority permits certain agencies

of the Government to enter into direct loans, purchase agreements, loan guarantees, and equipment and facilities installations.

Testimony before the committee, as well as supplementary information furnished the committee, points to this item as being one of the most important in our national defense efforts, also one in which great waste is possible if not properly administered. The committee has received information which indicates that the current maximum possible liability of the government, based on applications received to date under provisions of sections 302 and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, is $3,952,000,000.

While this entire program of plant expansion is presumed to be based on military logistics, it is evident that it must be carried out very carefully and only after the establishment of definite plans. This country cannot afford to waste its substance on development programs which in the final analysis will serve little or perhaps no purpose.

It should be pointed out that justification of the program as presented to the committee was not conclusive. The requested amount of $1,000,000,000, was derived by totaling the amounts requested in individual applications, and then estimating by way of percentages, averages, or arbitrary amounts as to what the total probable needs would be during the remainder of the current fiscal year. The committee appreciates the "imponderables and uncertainties" with which the Defense Production Administration was faced in preparing this estimate, and it is for this reason that the committee must and does demand a careful and strict stewardship of this tremendous sum of money. While, admittedly, expenditures under this program will be heaviest during the first year, or perhaps the first 2 years, the amount of money involved is so large as to have a tremendous effect on our domestic economy. If the program is well and carefully administered it will serve the intended purpose. If it is not administered carefully it may very well result in serious disruptions in our industrial pattern and dislocations in the general economy of the nation.

Testimony before the committee disclosed that no effort has been thus far made to exchange information between the Department of Defense and the Defense Production Administration with respect to their respective programs for loans and plant expansion. It was testified further that such collaboration would be of no particular advantage, and that it would only complicate matters. The committee does not agree with this point of view and, accordingly, suggests that the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration establish a small liaison group for the sole purpose of keeping in touch, not only with all of the programs of the Department of Defense, but with Reconstruction Finance Corporation plant expansion loans being made, and with the General Services Administration concerning stockpiling activities carried on with funds appropriated in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act. Otherwise, it would seem to the committee, that the stated objectives and methods of reaching those objectives, would not be uniform and would result in confusion and waste of funds.

The committee strongly urges the Defense Production Administration, when legislation to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act is being considered, that it suggest to the Legislative Committee the incorporation of provisions designed to recapture a portion of the tremendous indirect costs involved in accelerated tax amortiza-

tion certificates. It would seem no more than fair for the industries that have received five-year accelerated tax amortization certificates, and who continue to operate plants beyond the five year period, to apply a percentage of their profits through an adjusted depreciation schedule. Further, it is suggested that all firms now applying, or firms who already have received tax amortization certificates, be informed of a probable recapture clause in the pending legislation.

Federal Civil Defense Administration

The Committee received estimates contained in House Document No. 68, in the amount of $403,000,000. Against this there is recommended an appropriation of $186,750,000. To date the President has allocated $1,210,000 from the Emergency Fund for the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The estimate as submitted to Congress would provide for administrative expenses for the remainder of the present fiscal year and for funds to match state contributions for organizational equipment and protective shelters and facilities for the fiscal year 1952. It is anticipated that another estimate will be submitted to Congress in the near future to carry forward the Civil Defense program.

The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 does not specifically prescribe the approach to be taken in the establishment of an effective civil defense system. Accordingly, the problem facing the civil defense authorities and the Congress at the present time is one of concept. It would seem that the most urgent need, viewed in the light of testimony before the committee, is to educate the general public in matters of self-protection and to mold into one whole the individual efforts now being made by States and municipalities.

The plans upon which the estimates submitted to the committee were based, appeared to be of a nebulous nature and to have been coordinated only slightly with the Military forces of the Nation. For example, funds were requested for an attack warning system to be operated by Civil Defense personnel. At the present time there exists a wholly adequate and efficient civilian attack warning system in the Air Force, and the committee can see no need for the Civil Defense personnel to take over this work. The taking over of this warning system by the Civil Defense authorities would jeopardize the functions of the Air Force.

It appears to the committee that one of the greatest protections to the civilian population under conditions of modern warfare is an effective radar system and the committee suggests to the Department of Defense that every possible effort be made to expand the present system to its ultimate effectiveness and to make it as nearly perfect as it is possible to do so.

The present plans of the Civil Defense Administration contemplate fulfillment, not in the present calendar year, but after 1951. The Committee received testimony from leaders in the Government which emphasized the point that the Nation faces its greatest danger from enemy action during the present calendar year. In other words, even if vast sums were appropriated for Civil Defense they would be of no practical value since with the current planning of the Civil Defense Administration they could not be effectively expended in time to meet the present emergency.

In the face of these facts the Committee feels that the best approach to the Civil Defense problem is to provide the various States and municipalities with a trained corps of personnel skilled in the various phases of Civil Defense, qualified to activate and administer a sound Civil Defense program when it is formulated by the Federal Government. This calls for the establishment of the necessary training schools by the Federal Government to train local leaders as well as to disseminate information and guidance to the states for the education of the general public.

The Civil Defense Administrator has recommended the establishment of one staff college and three technical training schools, as quickly as possible. The Committee believes that this recommendation is sound and therefore has approved the request for training and education in the amount of $787,000. It feels, however, that the present program does not place enough emphasis on the education of the general public, and, accordingly, has included in the bill an additional amount to $103,000 for the training and education activity. This money should be used to educate the man on the street in ways in which he can protect himself and his family from any disaster that might befall them as a result of enemy action.

Communications.—The basis for any defense of the civilian populace is a strong communication system, able to alert it to any possible danger, and to coordinate the activities of all agencies concerned in the event of an emergency.

The estimate received by the Committee for the communication system was $5,660,000. Against this there is recommended an appropriation of $5,110,000 of which $110,000 is for 100 percent Federal contributions to the states and the remaining $5,000,000 for matching state contributions. The latter amount is included in the appropriation for Federal contributions. The committee has allowed substantially the amount requested for communication equipment which includes sirens, two way radios, and larger type transmitters and receivers. It is of the opinion, however, that a more effective and less expensive program can be developed by a greater utilization of existing alerting equipment and by a retardation in the purchase of other communication equipment until the time that skilled personnel is available to handle it.

For example, the estimate as submitted includes $2,000,000 for the purchase of 2,000 sirens. It would be most desirable to have a special type of siren for all civil defense alerts as is contemplated in the estimates. Certainly, however, there exists in every key center alert signals which can be coordinated with special sirens and utilized in lieu of a complete new system.

Two way radios for wardens and other such personnel are highly desirable. Information has been received, however, from the Army Signal Corps which discloses a shortage of this type of equipment in the military forces and that any diversion of equipment to nonmilitary channels during the present calendar year would be to the detriment of the military services. At the present time there is a delay of 15 to 18 months in securing such equipment. Thus it would be difficult to obtain the material requested in the estimates during the fiscal year 1952. It is expected that production will reach a level in the fall of 1952 to enable all military and civilian defense needs to be supplied. The large commercial-type transmitters and receivers contemplated by a 100% Federal payment are available with little delay.

Executive Direction.—The Executive Direction activity is the administrative and operational program of the agency. Estimates were received for this activity in the amount of $1,515,000. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $750,000. If proper plans are to be formulated and implemented a competent staff must be made available to the Director. Each person selected for employment must be properly screened as to ability, and under Public Law 920 of the 81st Congress a substantial number must be subjected to a loyalty examination. The Committee is well aware of the fact that the departmental staff for the Civil Defense Administration must be highly skilled. It is obvious, however, that the organizational structure, as envisioned by the estimates, appears to be unrealistic and top-heavy. A more realistic approach to the organization of the departmental staff of the Administration in Washington would result in substantial savings and in a more highly efficient organization. The proposed change in the approach to our civil defense requirements calls for a much smaller staff than might have been required for an all-out but uncoordinated program.

Protective facilities.—The availability of protective facilities is vital to the protection of the civilian populace in our key industrial and population centers. Such a program is by its very nature costly. With atomic bombing an ever present factor to be considered, the type of shelter needed has not as yet been fully developed. Sufficient information is available to enable a start to be made on a survey of existing facilities and where possible to strengthen them to serve as shelter areas. Unless proper control is maintained over the funds available for this work there is nothing to prevent money being expended without desirable results and at an astronomical cost to the Government. It is recommended that $75,000,000 be appropriated to remain available until June 30, 1952. In this manner the program can be carried forward at a reasonable cost. When accurate standards for the construction of shelters are available it can be implemented by additional appropriations. Up to the time of hearings no requests for cooperative improvement of facilities have been received.

Procurement fund.—The amount of $5,000,000 is recommended for the establishment of a working fund for the purpose of purchasing organizational equipment, the fund to be reimbursed upon delivery of the equipment to the States. Such a fund will permit the purchase of equipment on a mass basis at a resulting lower cost. It will also allow the Federal Government to control the standardization of equipment and will do away with many costly small purchases the States must make. Through this medium purchasing may be planned to conform to governmental economy and allocation plans. The reduction in the estimate for organizational equipment makes a greater working fund unnecessary.

Other Activities.—Estimates were also received for other activities of the Civil Defense Administration such as fire-fighting, warden, engineering, transportation, medical and welfare services, reserve supply operations, and research and development. The committee is rather amazed at the approach the Civil Defense Administration appears to be taking with reference to these activities. Instead of seeking to have the states and municipalities start their own programs the position of the Federal Civil Defense authorities appears to be that of having the

states wait until the Federal Government can make contributions to allow them to go ahead with their programs. Such a position is diametrically opposed to the basic intent of the enabling legislation. The Civil Defense Act of 1950 envisions the Federal Government as a coordinating and guiding agency. Beyond that the primary responsibility for the implementation of the program rests with the states and municipalities. A more effective utilization of state and municipal resources both financial and otherwise must be made if the Civil Defense program in these fields is to be realized. The activities contemplated by these estimates are contingent to a great degree upon long-range fulfillment. To that extent they can be deferred until more concrete plans can be formulated and until stronger programs can be developed by the individual states and municipalities.

Emergency Fund.—The bill contains $100,000,000 and the necessary language for an emergency fund to be available only in the event of a proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency. The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 sets forth the conditions for such a proclamation. This appropriation becomes available to the Administrator and the President immediately upon the issuance of such a proclamation based on an actual or anticipated enemy attack.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

H. Doc. No.	Agency	Estimate	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimate
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
69	Expenses of Defense Production	$51, 000, 000	$38, 000, 000	−$13, 000, 000
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES			
68	Federal Civil Defense Administration:			
	Operations	[1] 128, 000, 000	1, 750, 000	−126, 250, 000
	Federal Contributions	[2] 250, 000, 000	[3] 80, 000, 000	−170, 000, 000
	Procurement Fund	25, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	−20, 000, 000
	Emergency Fund	0	100, 000, 000	+100, 000, 000
	Total, Federal Civil Defense Administration	403, 000, 000	186, 750, 000	−216, 250, 000
	Total, (Chapter XI)	$454, 000, 000	$224, 750, 000	−$229, 250, 000

[1] Includes Federal contributions for organizational and communication equipment.
[2] For protective facilities only.
[3] Includes $75,000,000 for protective facilities; $5,000,000 for communications equipment.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried are included in the bill:

On page 6, relating to Federal Prison System, buildings and facilities:

Provided, That the limitation under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1951, on the cost of completion of the replacement of a power plant at the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, is repealed.

On page 14, relating to Maritime Activities, vessel operation revolving fund:

VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

For working capital for the "Vessel Operations Revolving Fund", which is hereby created for the purpose of carrying out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Commerce, including charter, operation, mointenance, repair, reconditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, $20,000,000, to remain availoble until expended.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for shipping services rendered under said Fund sholl be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Fund shall be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities conducted thereunder: Provided, That the provisions of sections 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) ond 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be applicable in connection with such operations and to seamen employed through general agents as employees of the United Statcs, who may be emplcyed in accordance with customary commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwithstonding the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the employment of persons by the United States: Provided further, That such sums as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 per centum of vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this Fund to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as stated therein: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any working funds or of allocation accounts established, subsequent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore and hereafter received from such activities, may be tronsferred to and consolidated with this Fund, which shall be available for the purposes of such working funds or allocation accounts.

No moncy appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: Provided, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchont Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: Provided further, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 per centum

per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.

On page 18, relating to Expenses of Defense Production:

Provided, That appropriations under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and improvements necessary for the proper use by the Government, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a):

On page 18, relating to Expenses of Defense Production:

Provided further, That the aggregate of borrowings from the Treasury pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which may be outstanding at any one time is increased from "$600,000,000" to "$1,600,000,000":

On page 18, relating to Expenses of Defense Production:

Provided further, That any appropriation to any department, agency, or corporation, in the executive branch of the Government, for salaries and expenses, shall be available for the discharge of responsibilities, relating to the national defense, assigned to such department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law:

On page 20, relating to Federal Civil Defense Administration, federal contributions:

Provided further, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.

On page 20, relating to Federal Civil Defense Administration, civil defense procurement fund:

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement fund", which is hereby established for the purpose of financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of materials or organizational equipment for which financial contributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made on a matching basis by subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $5,000,000. Said fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said materials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance, or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

On page 21, relating to Federal Civil Defense Administration, civil defense emergency fund:

CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND

For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund," $100,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: Provided, That said fund shall be available only in the event of a proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as provided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress) and shall be expended in accordance with the powers vested in the President and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration by title III of said Act.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 2 (A) OF RULE XIII

(Pending Bill)

On page 7 line 23, and on page 8, line 1 through line 6 in connection with the Department of Commerce:

Provided, That no request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952 of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair.

(Existing Law)

Public Law 840, Eightieth Congress, Sec. 17:

(d) No request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair to a public airport submitted pursuant to this section shall be considered by the Administrator unless such request has been submitted to him within six months after the occurrence of the damage upon which the request is based, except that in case of a request relating to damage caused by operations of a military nature during time of war, such request may be submitted within six months after the date of termination of such war unless the airport is under the control and management of the United States at the time of termination of such war, in which event the request may be submitted to the Administrator within six months after the transfer of such control or management of the airport to the public agency involved.

Public Law 343, Eighty-first Congress:

Provided, That for the purposes of section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, the date of enactment hereof shall be considered as the date of termination of war as contemplated by such section.

Union Calendar No. 70

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

[Report No. 298]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 6, 1951

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of Revenues of the District of Columbia)

General Administration

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Office of the Corporation Counsel", $5,000; and the limitation under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951 on the amount available for the settlement of claims is increased from "$7,000" to "$12,000".

Fiscal Service

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

For additional amounts for "Collector's Office", fiscal year 1949, $653,568, and fiscal year 1951, $144,700.

Courts

UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "United States courts", $265,443.

Public Welfare

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For additional amounts for "Saint Elizabeths Hospital", fiscal year 1949, $13,704, and fiscal year 1950, $22,604.

1 SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

2 For an additional amount for the payment of claims
3 in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in ac-
4 cordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11,
5 1929, as amended (46 Stat. 500), $7,493.

6 JUDGMENTS

7 For the payment of final judgments rendered against
8 the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Document
9 Numbered 67 (82d Congress), together with such further
10 sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceed-
11 ing 4 per centum per annum on such judgments, as provided
12 by law, from the date the same became due until the date
13 of payment, $5,580.

14 AUDITED CLAIMS

15 For an additional amount for the payment of claims,
16 certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District
17 of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which
18 have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the
19 District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title
20 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1948
21 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in House Document Num-
22 bered 67 (82d Congress), $4,648.

CHAPTER II

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

House of Representatives

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", $1,000, to remain available until expended.

Architect of the Capitol

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For an additional amount, for liquidation of contract authority, for the House and Senate improvements authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the Acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472), Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, $268,000, of which $168,000 shall be available for the House improvements and $100,000 for the Senate improvements.

For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings", $3,000.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For an additonal amount for "House office buildings", including furniture and furnishings, $21,500.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

American Sections, International Commissions

For an additional amount for "American sections, international commissions", $36,500, which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations"; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available to enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "International information and educational activities", for facilities for radio transmission and reception, and so forth, as authorized in the third proviso under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, $9,533,939, to remain available until expended; and the limitation contained in said proviso is increased from "$41,288,000" to "$50,821,939".

1 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

2 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

4 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
5 general legal activities", $30,000.

6 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
9 $6,147,000; and appropriations granted under this head for
10 the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for the purchase of
11 seven hundred passenger motor vehicles in addition to those
12 heretofore provided.

13 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

15 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
16 Bureau of Prisons", $125,000.

17 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

18 For an additional amount for "Support of United
19 States prisoners", $139,000.

20 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

21 For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities",
22 $1,380,000, for replacement of the power and heating
23 plants of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia:

1 *Provided,* That the limitation under this head in the Depart-
2 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1951, on the cost of
3 completion of the replacement of a power plant at the
4 United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, is repealed.

5 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

6 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

7 CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

8 For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport
9 Act", $1,464,384, to remain available until June 30, 1953,
10 as follows: Visalia Municipal Airport, Visalia, California,
11 $40,277; Gainesville Municipal Airport, Gainesville, Florida,
12 $9,467; Waycross-Ware County Airport, the city of Way-
13 cross and Ware County, Georgia, $55,417; Harding Field,
14 the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $140,650; New
15 Orleans Airport, Orleans Levee District and the Orleans
16 Airport Commission, Louisiana, $257,237; Laurence G.
17 Hanscom Field, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, $91,-
18 528; English Field, Amarillo, Texas, $29,590; Rio Grande
19 Valley International Airport, Brownsville, Texas, $384,161;
20 Eaker Airfield, Durant, Oklahoma, $359,580; Jefferson
21 County Airport, Jefferson County, Texas, $40,593; and the
22 Draughon-Miller Municipal Airport, Temple, Texas,
23 $55,884: *Provided,* That no request for reimbursement of

1 the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed
2 under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be con-
3 sidered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951,
4 and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress
5 after July 1, 1952 of the actual or estimated cost of such
6 rehabilitation or repair.

7 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

8 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For an additional amount for "Civil Aeronautics Board,
10 salaries and expenses", $25,000.

11 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL

13 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
14 departmental", $450,000.

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FIELD

16 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
17 field", $70,000.

18 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

19 TONGASS FOREST HIGHWAYS, ALASKA

20 For surveys, construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
21 nance of Tongass forest highways in Alaska in accordance
22 with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway
23 Act of 1950, $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

1 PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS

2 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the
3 contract authorization granted by section 10 of the Federal-
4 Aid Highway Act of 1950, $750,000, to remain available
5 until expended.

6 THE JUDICIARY

7 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

8 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

9 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Fees
10 of commissioners", $25,000.

11 FEES OF JURORS

12 For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", $200,000.

13 CHAPTER IV

14 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

15 BUREAU OF THE MINT

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
18 $130,000.

19 COAST GUARD

20 OPERATING EXPENSES

21 For an additional amount for "Operating expenses",
22 $1,000,000.

1 ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

2 For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction,
3 and improvements", $350,000, to remain available until
4 expended.

5 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

6 (Out of the postal revenues)

7 POSTAL OPERATIONS

8 For an additional amount for "Postal operations",
9 $7,500,000.

10 TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS

11 For an additional amount for "Transportation of mails",
12 for payment of increased rates to railroad carriers for 1951
13 and prior fiscal years, in accordance with Interstate Com-
14 merce Commission Order of December 4, 1950 (Docket
15 Numbered 9200), $152,000,000.

16 FIELD SERVICE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

17 OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

18 Clerks, First- and Second-Class Post Offices

19 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Clerks,
20 first- and second-class post offices", $150,000, to be derived
21 by transfer from the appropriation "Clerks, third-class post
22 offices, 1947".

OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Railroad transportation and mail messenger service", $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Domestic air mail service, 1948".

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employees' Compensation

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation fund", $3,000,000.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For an additional amount for "Forest development roads and trails", $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Commodity Credit Corporation

The limitation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$16,350,000" to "$19,100,000".

1 CHAPTER VII

2 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

3 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
6 $2,000.

7 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

8 CONSTRUCTION

9 For an additional amount for "Construction", $3,650,-
10 000, to remain available until expended.

11 TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

12 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

13 For an additional amount for "Construction, Alaska
14 Railroad", $4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

15 CHAPTER VIII

16 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

17 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

18 ANNUITIES, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WIDOWS

19 For payment of annuities as authorized by the Act of
20 August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465), $204,500.

21 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

22 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

23 The amount authorized to be transferred from the ap-
24 propriation granted under this head in the Supplemental

1 Appropriation Act, 1951, to the appropriation "Operating
2 expenses", for the reactivation of industrial plants, is increased
3 from "$14,000,000" to "$26,000,000".

4 EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

5 Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal
6 year 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and
7 improvements to public buildings under the control of the
8 General Services Administration.

9 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

10 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

11 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
12 sions", $26,618,000, to remain available until expended.

13 AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR DISABLED
14 VETERANS

15 To enable the Administrator to provide, or assist in pro-
16 viding, automobiles or other conveyances for disabled vet-
17 erans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950
18 (Public Law 798), $800,000.

19 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

20 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

21 MARITIME TRAINING

22 The limitation under the head "Maritime training",
23 United States Maritime Commission, in the Independent

1 Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available
2 for administrative personal services and so forth is increased
3 from "$2,477,000" to "$2,532,000".

4 VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

5 For working capital for the "Vessel Operations Revolv-
6 ing Fund", which is hereby created for the purpose of carry-
7 ing out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Com-
8 merce, including charter, operation, maintenance, repair, re-
9 conditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the
10 jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, $20,000,000, to
11 remain available until expended.

12 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for
13 shipping services rendered under said Fund shall be pre-
14 scribed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Fund shall
15 be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities
16 conducted thereunder: *Provided,* That the provisions of sec-
17 tions 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) and 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-
18 eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be appli-
19 cable in connection with such operations and to seamen
20 employed through general agents as employees of the United
21 States, who may be employed in accordance with customary
22 commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwith-
23 standing the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the
24 employment of persons by the United States: *Provided fur-*
25 *ther,* That such sums as may be determined to be necessary

1 by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the
2 Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 per centum of
3 vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this Fund
4 to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes
5 of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating
6 functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as
7 stated therein: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any
8 other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any
9 working funds or of allocation accounts established, subse-
10 quent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for
11 under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore
12 and hereafter received from such activities, may be trans-
13 ferred to and consolidated with this Fund, which shall be
14 available for the purposes of such working funds or allo-
15 cation accounts.

16 No money appropriated by this or any other Act may
17 be used for the payment to the owner on account of the
18 purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States
19 is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United
20 States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United
21 States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated
22 cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent
23 to such sale by the United States: *Provided,* That, in the
24 case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted
25 pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant

1 Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall
2 not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of
3 March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of
4 capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to
5 such date: *Provided further,* That in the case of a bona fide
6 purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed
7 the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such pur-
8 chaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal
9 Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United
10 States is chartered or taken for use by the United States,
11 the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall
12 not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted
13 under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were
14 purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the
15 preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with
16 the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue
17 for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such
18 schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5
19 per centum per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of
20 any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the
21 Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose
22 whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by
23 the United States, except in accordance with the preceding
24 provisions.

1 CHAPTER IX

2 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

3 CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

4 THE PANAMA CANAL

5 CIVIL GOVERNMENT

6 For an additional amount for "Civil government",
7 $72,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
8 "Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal."

9 CORPS OF ENGINEERS

10 NIAGARA POWER DEVELOPMENT

11 For engineering and economic investigations, pending
12 authorization for construction, of projects for development
13 and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the
14 Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the
15 treaty between the United States of America and Canada,
16 signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States
17 Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until ex-
18 pended, $450,000.

19 CHAPTER X

20 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

21 INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK

22 To enable the President, during the fiscal year 1951, to
23 carry out the provisions of title V of the Foreign Economic

1 Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 209), relating to inter-
2 national children's welfare work, $5,000,000.

3 CHAPTER XI

4 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

5 EXPENSES OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION

6 For an additional amount for "Expenses of defense
7 production", $38,000,000: *Provided,* That appropriations
8 under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available
9 for rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of
10 Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and
11 improvements necessary for the proper use by the Govern-
12 ment, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30,
13 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a): *Provided further,*
14 That the appropriation to the President for Emergencies
15 (National Defense) shall be reimbursed from funds con-
16 tained herein for allocations made therefrom to any agency
17 of the Government for carrying out the provisions of the
18 Defense Production Act of 1950 after March 31, 1951:
19 *Provided further,* That the aggregate of borrowings from
20 the Treasury pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense
21 Production Act of 1950 which may be outstanding at any
22 one time is increased from "$600,000,000" to "$1,600,-
23 000,000": *Provided further,* That any appropriation to any
24 department, agency, or corporation, in the executive branch

1 of the Government, for salaries and expenses, shall be avail-
2 able for the discharge of responsibilities, relating to the na-
3 tional defense, assigned to such department, agency, or
4 corporation by or pursuant to law: *Provided further*, That
5 the appropriation "Expenses of Defense Production" may
6 be increased by transfer of not to exceed $1,834,000 of
7 funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 to the Depart-
8 ments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and the
9 General Services Administration for the purpose of carrying
10 out the duties and responsibilities assigned to these agencies
11 under provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

12 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

13 FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

14 OPERATIONS

15 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in
16 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act
17 of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including pur-
18 chase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor
19 vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
20 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the
21 Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of em-
22 ployees occupying positions of critical importance from the
23 standpoint of national security; and expenses of attendance
24 at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; $1,750,-

1 000: *Provided,* That $110,000 shall be available for pro-
2 viding civil defense communications systems pursuant to
3 subsection (c) of section 201 of said Act.

4 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

5 For financial contributions to the States pursuant to
6 subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense
7 Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June
8 30, 1952: *Provided,* That of this amount $75,000,000 shall
9 be available only for shelters and other protective facilities:
10 *Provided further,* That the Administrator shall not approve
11 any programs or projects for such shelters and protective
12 facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within
13 the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts
14 to be made available by the States to match contributions
15 hereunder.

16 CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

17 For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement
18 fund", which is hereby established for the purpose of
19 financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of mate-
20 rials or organizational equipment for which financial con-
21 tributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made
22 on a matching basis by subsection (i) of section 201 of
23 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $5,000,000. Said
24 fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said mate-
25 rials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance,

1 or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable
2 appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such
3 materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to
4 any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of
5 materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be
6 in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

7 CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND

8 For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund", $100,000,-
9 000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided,*
10 That said fund shall be available only in the event of a
11 proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as pro-
12 vided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of
13 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress) and shall be ex-
14 pended in accordance with the powers vested in the Presi-
15 dent and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Adminis-
16 tration by title III of said Act.

17 CHAPTER XII

18 CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND
19 JUDGMENTS

20 For payment of claims for damages as settled and deter-
21 mined by departments and agencies in accord with law,
22 audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting
23 Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by
24 United States district courts and the United States Court of
25 Claims, as set forth in House Document Numbered 85,

1 Eighty-second Congress, $1,999,045, together with such
2 amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when
3 specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements
4 of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and
5 such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as
6 may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Pro-*
7 *vided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid
8 until it shall have become final and conclusive against the
9 United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise:
10 *Provided further,* That, unless otherwise specifically required
11 by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever
12 appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than
13 thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

14 CHAPTER XIII

15 GENERAL PROVISIONS

16 SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in
17 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
18 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
19 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against
20 the Government of the United States or who is a member of
21 an organization of Government employees that asserts the
22 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
23 or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that
24 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
25 States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes

1 hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence
2 that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the
3 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
4 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
5 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
6 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
7 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
8 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Gov-
9 ernment of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*
10 *further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the
11 Government of the United States or who is a member of an
12 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
13 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
14 who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that
15 advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
16 States by force or violence and accepts employment the
17 salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation
18 or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,
19 upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or
20 imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided*
21 *further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition
22 to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of
23 existing law: *Provided further,* That, as applicable to the
24 Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this sec-
25 tion shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person

1 employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work
2 involving the loss of human life or destruction of property,
3 and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such
4 persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered
5 in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-
6 templated by this section.

7 SEC. 1302. This Act may be cited as the "Third Sup-
8 plemental Appropriation Act, 1951".

Union Calendar No. 70

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

[Report No. 298]

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CANNON

APRIL 6, 1951

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

in the District of Columbia are the ones most interested in the passage of this legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Will this legislation make the old cow give her milk an hour later and the hen lay her egg an hour earlier?

Mr. TACKETT. I presume it will. They would have you believe it will perform magic. You know that it does not do a bit of good in this world except to add additional confusion. Now, does that train down there at Union Station leave at 3 o'clock standard time, Washington time, or New York time, will be a stock question after the adoption of this legislation. Do you mean standard time or daylight-saving time will be asked a million times.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under the law the railroads have to stay on standard time. They are not permitted to accept daylight-saving time. Under the Interstate Commerce regulation they have to be on standard time. The Federal Court has ruled that they must be on standard time. So that it does make confusion.

Mr. TACKETT. Washington, D. C., is the center of activities in this country, and I venture to say that if we will turn down this legislation you will see the few eastern cities go back to standard time.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. According to this book, Washington Confidential, apparently a lot of unsavory activities go on after dark. So I assume that is the motive in trying to have more daylight at night.

Mr. TACKETT. Well, it is a shame and disgrace for the congressional membership to be called on to argue about something that is so ridiculous. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] said, it is ridiculous to take the time of this Congress to talk about nothing.

I hope that once and for all this Congress will set this matter straight that we can then carry on in the regular fashion that we have been following for many years in the past.

There is absolutely no need for this legislation. The District of Columbia wants it? I have not been convinced of that; I have not seen any vote or poll that would convince me that the District of Columbia wants it. It may be that a few newspapers want it, but I will guarantee you that every one of those employees of the newspapers who want it are anxious to get in a little more golf.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this question of daylight-savings time has come up year after year for the past 12 years since I have been here, and I should like to see it settled once and for all. I think that the people of the District of Columbia ought to have a chance to decide it for themselves so this House would not have to impose the will of every State in the Union on the District of Columbia. The quicker we vote home rule through here the better off they will be.

It has been my contention that the people of the District of Columbia who come from every State in the Union should have the right to their own self-government. They ought to be able to vote to choose their own candidates and to elect their own officers, and to have their own self-government without the government by indirection as the Congress of the United States is bound to impose upon them; so when this question comes up or any other question comes up through the years it seems to me that we are not being fair to the people of the District of Columbia, that they ought to be able to decide upon these questions for themselves:

It was said here a little while ago that up in New York State because we had daylight-saving time that they ought not to force the District of Columbia to have daylight-saving time. Well, it happens that we have had daylight-saving time up in New York State for a good many years. We get along with it. Some of us do not like it, but some of us do; so for that reason it seems to me that the people of the District of Columbia ought to be able to decide what they want. People live here who come from every State in the Union; they come from New York State, they come from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, out West and down South.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Would the gentleman from New York be willing to put off daylight-saving time until they have home rule in the District of Columbia?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I imagine that will be quite a while, because it looks to me as though they are not going to get home rule very soon. For some reason or other they always seem to pull some sleight-of-hand performance so that the people of the District of Columbia do not get home rule.

They ought to be able to decide this question for themselves. It is just like forcing an archaic method of choosing candidates in a worn-out convention system, which I have always been against. I have always maintained that candidates ought to be chosen by direct primary system. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is an issue which ought to be decided by the people of the District of Columbia; they ought to decide whether they want it or not, and I do not think it is up to the Congress of the United States to continue to force the question on them year after year.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. I just want to correct the statement which was made by the gentleman from Arkansas when he said that only in New York and a few cities on the eastern seaboard do they have daylight saving time. They have fast time in the State of California; they have it in the cities of Chicago, St. Louis, and most of the other cities of the country have it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. And I would include the triple cities area of Endicott, Johnson City, and Binghamton, where 20,000 Endicott-Johnson workers and 10,000 International Business Machine workers and 8,000 Ansco workers have enjoyed daylight saving time. They seem to have gotten along well with it, and it gives them a chance to get out and work their gardens and to make life happier for themselves.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell us his opinion of the effect on the morale of the boys fighting and dying in Korea to provide a little more time here at home?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Answering the gentleman, I think we can be doing bigger and better things than thrashing this question out for the people of the District of Columbia. Let us give them home rule. Then they can decide.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Is the gentleman for or against this measure?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, the gentleman has been for it in years gone by and he has also voted against it. The question is still being presented that we have to pass on, but the people of the District of Columbia should decide the question for themselves.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, this being the annual field day for horn blowing and any kind of demagoguery one may want to think up concerning daylight savings for the District, I thought I might offer a practical word to salve the conscience of those who would like to promote a little economy in government. Those of you who know about these temporary buildings down the street here in the District, and who have served in Washington in the summertime as I have for the past 12 years, will remember that when the temperature outdoors gets up to around the boiling point the people down in these temporary buildings have to let the office workers out because the temperature inside the building gets so high girls faint at their desks, and so forth. If you are looking for an economy reason to vote for this bill you might remember that by having daylight savings in the District of Columbia we would get 1 hour more work out of a great many of your employees in the District by having them start to work an hour earlier in relation to the sun. That is a pretty good reason itself. Those of you who have been here in summer and who have seen what goes on in those oven-like temporary buildings on a hot day will realize that.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Minnesota I know has a stick with a barb on the end of it. What is it?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman concedes whether we have daylight-saving time or do not have it they would have to let these office workers go under either system?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, but if they started 1 hour earlier by sun time they could get in 1 hour more work before being let out.

Mr. O'HARA. If you wake up when it is 90 in the shade, they would get off just an hour earlier, that is all.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right, but I find that an hour earlier is a nice time to get up in the morning in the summertime when the dew is still on the grass and before the sun has had time to make steam out of it. Anybody who wants to live here in the summertime just for the fun of it can do so as far as I am concerned.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why can we not settle this whole thing by the departments ordering the employees to go to work an hour earlier?

Mr. HINSHAW. That runs into a lot of schedules of various kinds. It involves transportation, it involves the police system, it involves practically everything. If they go to work an hour earlier you might just as well set the clock for it because it would involve everybody and be far simpler. It is a mighty good idea. Every year we have gone through this kind of a battle with the same lot of horn blowing and eventually we vote for the bill. We might as well do it now and get it over with and conserve the time of the Congress for really important matters.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress unconsciously and unintentionally creates a lot of confusion in this country. Today we are going into it, however, with our eyes open. Some people would vote to create more confusion by voting for daylight-saving time.

A gentleman referred a moment ago to these poor office workers down here who want to get off when it gets hot, who do not want to work, while the Government pays them. They talk about a poll for the people of Washington and that they want daylight-saving time, but those same people who want daylight-saving time, if they were polled would vote for a 30-hour week or longer vacations or less work and more pay. I am getting tired of this think of paying for work we do not get any way. I am getting tired of these lobbies of Government workers around here always trying to put on the pressure to make the job lighter and the pay greater. This is just another instance of where they are trying to put something over on the people, and the taxpayers are the ones that are paying the bill. If you want to cut out this foolishness let us go on and defeat this bill and you will find a lot of these other towns getting back on standard time and we will avoid all of this confusion that has resulted because of this crazy, nonsensical idea that somebody is going to save an hour by having daylight saving time. In my opinion this is one of the most foolish things that man ever thought of. I do not know who was responsible for it, but Congress does have an opportunity to vote down this bill, so let us do it and get back to work.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand the majority leader has indicated there would be no roll call on any bill today. I have been requested by several Members on our side to ask for a roll call, and I am wondering if it would be satisfactory to put it off until tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reach an agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on time for general debate.

Mr. TABER. I should think we ought to be able, from all I know of demands, to get along with an hour on a side.

Mr. CANNON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3587, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have only one chance of winning the next war—if there should be a next war, which God forbid—and that is the same means by which we won the last war—through superior production. The major part of the appropriation carried in the pending bill is for the express purpose of strengthening and accelerating defense production.

The principal provisions of the bill are for additional funds to continue the program under the Defense Production Act of 1950. I think all of us realize that in view of the critical situation abroad the support of this program is urgent and imperative.

The Defense Production Act became law on September 8, 1950, about 6 months ago. It was felt that time was of the essence, that we must produce strength and military power in time, and sufficient strength and power, to prevent attack from the outside. So, within the same month Congress appropriated $30,000,000 to start the program under the new bill.

Out of the spirit of rigid economy which the Committee on Appropriations has adopted and is following, a committee always economically inclined but now especially so, we cut the $60,000,000 recommended by the budget in half. We appropriated $30,000,000, on the theory that if more was necessary we could supply it when the time arrived.

In consonance with that idea, we are today recommending an additional $38,000,000, altogether $13,000,000 less than the Budget estimate, to implement the act for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year. This is to carry out the program, upon which everyone is now largely agreed, for the last 3 months of the fiscal year.

This amount, with the unobligated balance of March 31, $3,766,000, provides a total of $41,766,000 of available funds for expenses of defense production.

I shall speak at this time in detail of only one item, and very briefly on that item. It is the item of civil defense administration which we have cut, more drastically than any appropriation of this character has been cut before within my recollection.

Due to the drastic changes in the program which seem to obviate the necessity of the amount agreed upon when the authorization bill was before the House, we have cut our recommendation on this appropriation from $403,000,000 requested by the Bureau of the Budget to $186,750,000. However, we have taken precaution against any unexpected development or any unforeseen emergency by providing an unbudgeted $100,000,000 which will be available only in the event of a proclamation of emergency, which of course means only in the event of attack from abroad.

The total of the bill here submitted—the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1951—is $478,586,368, a reduction of $364,877,211 in the budget estimates. Of the total of something over $478,000,000 slightly over $457,000,000 is included under four chapters of the bill. These chapters include items of appropriation for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary; the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department; various independent offices; and the defense agencies.

Individual members of respective subcommittees having original jurisdiction

in the matter of appropriations for the various departments and agencies will take up the details of each item of appropriation. However, I might say generally that practically the entire amount recommended in the bill is either directly or indirectly related to the emergency situation in which the country now finds itself. Smaller amounts are recommended for regular activities of the Government made necessary because of changed conditions developing since the passage of the general appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951.

There is included under chapter XI—Defense Agencies—the amount of $224,750,000. Of this amount, $38,000,000 is for expenses of defense production for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, made necessary by the enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1950. The bill also includes an increase of $1,000,000,000 in the present authorization of $600,000,000 for expansion of productive capacity of private plants through loans and loan guarantees, and for procurement, as authorized under sections 302 and 303 of the Defense Production Act.

The major portion of the total under chapter XI, namely, $186,750,000, is for the Civil Defense Administration. This is broken down as follows:

Operations	$1,750,000
Federal contributions to States and municipalities	80,000,000
Establishment of a procurement fund	5,000,000
Emergency fund	100,000,000

This program, Mr. Chairman, is of great importance to the Nation, but should be embarked upon cautiously to preclude waste of Federal funds.

As I interpret the Civil Defense Act of 1950, the greatest responsibility should rest with the States and municipalities, with the Federal Government acting principally as coordinator and supplying such assistance as may be required on an over-all basis.

The emergency fund of $100,000,000 is made available in the event of actual or threatened attack and should suffice for such emergency activities as may be necessary during the early stages.

Mr. Chairman, this bill marks a change in the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations toward defense spending. Up until this time under the pressure of an international emergency—when an attack was to be expected at any minute, a situation in which no one knew at what moment the radio might report hostile planes coming in from the north, and under the necessity of getting ready, and getting ready quickly, we were disposed to agree to requests for the defense program without too careful scrutiny. Under such circumstances we resolved all questions of doubt in favor of expenditure. We had to be ready, and time was short. We did not feel that we could not subject ourselves to the onus should an attack come, of providing too little and too late.

Under current developments we have changed the routine and the formula. We are now checking estimates for the defense program as carefully as we check estimates for any other program. If there is any question of doubt as to the probity of the proposals received from the Bureau of the Budget and the armed services, we resolve the doubt in favor of economy and against expenditure.

You will note that we have begun to cut and cut drastically, and we are recommending to the House in this bill the very substantial reduction of $364,877,211.

And now as to the changing nature of the emergency. I think all Members of the House will agree that their mail in recent weeks reflects an easing of the tension, a relaxing of the anxiety which gripped the entire Nation at a time when we felt that we might be engulfed in a holocaust of war at any minute. The public and some high officials of Government have begun to feel that there will be no war this year. I am largely in accord. At least I want to be in accord. Perhaps the wish is father to the thought. But like the rest of them, I am hoping that no attack will be made upon us, that no necessity will arise for our defending our own borders within the next calendar year.

But, Mr. Chairman, it must be conceded that this conclusion is not final; that to some extent it is founded on hope, and that there are strong reasons why we might be wrong.

In the first place, if Russia strikes at all, if she launches a war with any hope of success, she must strike this year. Up until this time, up until this year, while America still slept, time worked to the advantage of the enemy. Every day with the enemy steadily and relentlessly increasing its war potentiality, and every day with our armament deteriorating and obsolescent, we grew relatively weaker and Russia grew relatively stronger.

But now that America is at last alert, the situation has changed, and time is working for America. Every day we grow relatively stronger, and with all her efforts, Russia grows relatively weaker. So if Russia expects to strike, the sooner she strikes, before we are completely ready, the more likely her chances of successs. With them it is now or never. That is the first reason why we should view with some caution our hope that war will not come this year. For if war does not come this year, if they will give us 1 year we will be to some degree ready—not completely ready, but at least far in advance of what we were at the beginning of the initiation of our defense program. And if they will give us 2 years more, America will be impregnable and invincible. So if any foreign foe expects to devastate the United States its chances grow daily less. If aggression is to come it must logically come this year. And there still remains a date beyond which we cannot consider ourselves safe; we must pass the harvest in the Ukraine before we can consider the possibility of attack this year definitely closed and we have yet to pass that critical date. In this connection, it must be remembered that the enemy always expects to make use of the element of surprise. In all their campaigns the element of surprise has been one of their most effective weapons. Unquestionably if they expected to attack this year, their first effort would be to lull us into a sense of security so that we would ease the speed and pressure of preparation in order that they might take us unaware. So the fact that there are some outside manifestations of a desire to continue the present status for the remainder of this is not necessarily a dependable factor. It may be recalled that at Munich in 1938 Hitler talked peace. He talked peace and urged conferences. This year Stalin is talking peace and is urging conferences. It is not entirely beyond the range of possibility that history might repeat itself. So, we cannot be certain. We cannot relax. We must go ahead, we must be strong, strong as never before, if we expect to avoid with certainty a third world war.

There are other disconcerting evidences: Vast stores of supplies, heavy mobilizations of troops are to be observed upon the borders and at strategic positions in Europe. Over in Korea for the first time the Communists have been supplied with a heavy contingent of efficient fighting planes, in quantity and quality never before supplied, and direct from the Russian arsenals.

And it was perhaps significant that at the recent conference of Pan American diplomats here in Washington, every representative from a South or Central American country, many of whom have access to dependable sources of international information, all without exception consider war inevitable. So, Mr. Chairman, we cannot rest on our oars; we must prepare as rapidly as possible; we must prepare for the worst. Then if, happily, our forebodings are not realized, the cost, heavy as it is, will be infinitesimal as compared with what it would have been had we not prepared.

There is another element that must be taken into consideration; that is, the extent of our resources, both financial and natural. In our frantic effort to get ready we might so encroach upon the limit between solvency and bankruptcy as to invite the very situation for which our enemy is planning. The greatest ally for which the Communists might wish, the greatest ally that could come to their assistance, is American bankruptcy. The most effective weapon we can have in this emergency is solvency.

General Eisenhower, that great commander, that great American now in supreme command of all the allied armies who is discharging his duties so well and effectively, expressed it perhaps as well as it could be expressed in a few words when he said:

> The program of defense is how far you can go without destroying from within what you are trying to defend from without.

We are meeting that phase of the situation in this bill. We are reducing this bill as no defense bill has ever been reduced since the initiation of the First World War in 1917. We are attempting to eliminate the nonessentials. In times like these we must draw the belt tight and we must forestall the danger which follows reckless expenditure and inflation, if not repudiation of national obligations, as well as meet the necessity of providing divisions, fleets, and air power.

A further reason why we should view with some doubt the conclusion we are all anxious to adopt—that there will be no war in this calendar year, is found in the history of our negotiations to end World War II. From 1945 down to the present date we have made every effort to agree with our adversary. There is an admonition in ancient writ, "Agree with thine adversary quickly." We have endeavored to follow that ancient admonition. We have made every effort to secure an agreement; we have made every concession; we have gone farther and sacrificed more than we should in an effort to prevail upon Russia to sign a treaty of peace. She has refused to sign a treaty of peace. She has refused to sign any kind of treaty. She has refused to agree to any kind of a peace and she has gone steadily ahead in these 6 years expending a disproportionate part of her national budget on armies and armament until she has today the greatest army the world ever saw, until she has produced today the greatest amount of tanks and submarines and planes any nation has ever produced far in excess of anything, in men and in equipment than the combined allies can marshal. We have continued our futile efforts to convince Russia that we are her friend, that we desired nothing but peace and international comity and commerce under which all the peoples of the world may be free and prosperous.

That was our unwavering policy, the policy of appeasement, until for the first time we issued an ultimatum of abandonment of appeasement and a determination to protect ourselves and the world from aggression and exploitation. And from that day we have pursued a policy of determined defense of American rights. Up to this time Stalin had been winning without a battle, without a shot vast territories, invaluable privileges, and work concessions for the asking, winning them without a battle, without a shot.

The blunt ultimatum of the President stopped him. It was the end of easy confiscations, of lush concessions, of international impositions. From this time forth Russia will violate international law only at the point of the sword. The President of the United States has put an end to international brigandage and piracy.

Communism can no longer continue its policy of imperial conquest and world domination except through a resort to arms. That is the only alternative. And that is what we must be prepared for. And that is what this bill is for.

Today, Mr. Chairman, when we look back at the record of these last 6 years, and it is 6 years this week, we cannot but be impressed with the results of the splendid diplomacy and the unvarying success of the policies of President Truman. In the years to come, when the history of this era is written, he will rank as one of the greatest Presidents who has presided in the White House since Lincoln.

He has avoided a third world war. He has brought to this country unexampled and unprecedented prosperity. He has given us the highest standard of living any people have ever enjoyed. He has stopped the spread of communism. He is curbing inflation. He has brought about a policy under which labor and management, if not in agreement, are at least working in harmony and unison. He has brought to the farmers of America fair prices and adequate markets. He has balanced the budget and there is a surplus in the Treasury. He has reduced the necessity for taxes, which a few months ago threatened to become all but confiscatory.

With due regard to the long line of great Presidents who have sat in the White House since Abraham Lincoln, you cannot point to any man whose policies have been so successful and who has achieved his objective so completely under such heavy burdens and against such seemingly insurmountable obstacles as has President Truman.

Let us examine the matter in some detail.

If I should ask the men sitting here in this Chamber this afternoon or the country at large, "What is the most important issue before the American people today? What one single thing do the people of this country most desire?" There is no doubt as to what the answer would be.

They would say, without a doubt, "Freedom from war—avoidance of the third world war." And that is the answer. It is the supreme issue in American politics today.

It is only necessary to glance across the Continent of Europe to realize what is at stake in that fateful issue. A notable feature of German diplomacy was that for centuries every war they fought was fought outside their own country. They devastated their neighbors. They laid waste the country and resources of their enemies. And when the war was over, even when Germany was defeated, they came back to a home country undisturbed, not a bridge destroyed, not a railroad rail moved, not a brick or shingle out of place.

But in this last war, for the first time, due to the development of modern warfare, we fought the war in Germany, and as a result, Germany today is a scene of the most terrible wreckage I have ever witnessed. Magnificent cities, the finest in Europe, are heaps of rubbish and piles of broken brick and mortar. They had to use bulldozers to clear even one street through Berlin.

America, like Germany, has always fought her foreign wars on the other side—never in this country. But when the next war comes, if war comes—which God forbid—it will be fought in this country as well as abroad. General Vandenberg—and no one is in a better position to make an estimate of the situation—said that in spite of all our radar fences, our walls of shipping, our networks of communication, and our clouds of intercepter planes, 70 percent of the enemy planes carrying atomic bombs would get through. We might as well fact that fact. Every center of production, every center of wealth and population and civilization would be devastated. We have only to look at the cities in Germany to see how the cities of America would look within 1 week after war started.

Up to this time, in spite of the greatest peril and notwithstanding the universal expectation of immediate war, under Truman's policy our stretching across the continent—our alabaster cities still gleam from sea to sea. The American people want to keep them that way. And if the American people appreciate anything at all they appreciate the magnificent statesmanship of a great President who under heavy handicaps has preserved them.

We must avoid war. War would bring not only unspeakable material devastation, but it would destroy millions of civilians who would die—men, women, and children—without notice and without hope of defense, as they died in Rotterdam and Frankfort and Hiroshima and a hundred other cities in the last war.

The President has rendered a service never to be forgotten in preserving and protecting the country thus far, and if the policies which he has been following in order to achieve safety for our Nation are continued he can and he will avoid for all time to come a third world war. Let us strengthen his hands as Aaron and Hur upheld the hands of Moses in Israel's hour of need.

Oh, some have said we should not have held the line in Korea; that we should have cravenly retreated and turned the country over to the enemy; that the President should have permitted Russia to add one more satellite to her string of enslaved nations. But I would have you remember that never before in history have two nations worked feverishly, day and night, to prepare for war, building all the paraphernalia of war, and mobilizing men for war, as Russia and America are preparing and building and mobilizing today without eventually crashing headlong in a conflagration of death and destruction. That war must come unless the diplomacy we have been following can save us. If it cannot, if war must come, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, should we have fought the war in Korea or should we have fought it in America? If we had cravenly retreated from Korea, if we had given over to the barbarians for exploitation the country which we had entered into a solemn treaty to defend, it would have merely postponed the evil day of reckoning. It eventually would have to come to us, not in Korea but in America. Who shall say that the President, in holding the line in Korea, in compliance with the terms of our solemn treaty obligations, was in error?

Why, you still hear, "Bring the boys home from Korea." In all the history of American diplomacy never was there a more craven, a more mistaken slogan—"Bring the boys home from Korea," when we have demonstated in Korea the superiority of American arms; when we have made a record for gallantry and for military effectiveness which no predatory nation can ignore. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in holding the line in Korea, in keeping our boys there, in win-

ning against incredible odds, the President of the United States has pushed back world war III. Certainly, if the President's policies are continued, we will have avoided world war III for all time. We will have defeated communism. We will have turned back aggression. We will have established again freedom for free peoples in a free world.

Oh, I know we could have deserted our allies. We could have come home and skulked within our own borders, as many of those misguided partisans suggested, until finally, after Russia had taken everything—and nobody denies that without our help she would have taken all Europe long ago—then, like a cornered rat, surrounded and isolated, without friends, without help, without munitions and steel and bases, which we must draw from our allies throughout the world, we would have been exterminated. Our Government, our great freedom, our wonderful civilization would have been extinguished, as throughout history great nations and great civilizations have been annihilated by ruthless barbarians, and it is not impossible that if such isolationist policies are followed an American counterpart may, when it is too late, lift his hands in an agony of remorse crying "Oh Amicus! Amicus! Give me back my legions. Give me back my legions."

The thanks of the American people and the thanks of the world are due the President of the United States for his policy of defense, for his wise and determined adherence to it in the face of all the cries of "Abandon Korea," "Bring the boys home," "Talk it over with Russia." Such a course could lead only to certain disaster. Korea has rendered the same service rendered by Pearl Harbor. Pearl Harbor awakened us before it was too late and made it possible for us to get ready in time; Korea has awakened us and made it possible for us to get ready, and the President of the United States has made the most of the advantage thus afforded us. He deserves the support and the appreciation of every American regardless of political affiliation.

What is the second issue in which the American people are interested? The people of the United States do not want another war; they want to avoid war No. 3. What next do they desire?

They desire prosperity; they ask for security; they ask for opportunities for themselves and for their children, and that the President of the United States has given them in abundance, such abundance as the world has never seen. Never before did the common man, did the average family, have as much as it has today. Who will deny that? The average man, the average family in America today enjoys not only the necessities of life, but luxuries and advantages which even kings and potentates of former years did not possess, and the President of the United States by his consistent policy has made that possible. It does not matter whether you call it the Fair Deal, the raw deal, or something else, he has adhered to a policy and it has given America the greatest prosperity any people in any land in any age ever knew.

And then perhaps the third issue most in demand today, at least one, of the issues, in which the American people are deeply interested and which they greatly desire, protection against communism. Communism had insidiously infiltrated every corner of every country. When Truman became President it had the upper hand in practically every nation in Europe. England would not go quite far all out, but England did go socialistic. France at one time had in her Chamber of Deputies a majority of Communists. So great was their control in Italy and in all adjacent countries that defense against communism seemed all but hopeless. Yet the President of the United States has united the free nations of the world against communism. In this combination to exterminate communism, many of you along with me attended the sessions, and saw the treaty signed, the beginning of that great campaign to free the world from communism. Since that afternoon we have witnessed the slow success of that policy. We have seen France again freed from communistic control, though there are still Communist deputies in her legislative halls. We have seen Italy in a life and death struggle overthrow the communistic power. We have seen all our allies under the leadership of the President of the United States, under the policies embodied in the treaties which he and they have signed, destroy slowly but surely the power of communism in every part of the world.

Never in recent years has communism been so impotent as it is in America today.

Then President Truman has balanced the budget. The increase in tax receipts and the decreased nondefense expenditures as estimated following publication of taxes paid the last month indicate a balanced budget for the year. It is now apparent that instead of a prospective deficit of $2,700,000,000 there will be a surplus of $3,000,000,000 in the Treasury at the end of the year. The receipts of the United States Treasury have skyrocketed under the policies of the President. Those increased receipts come from increased prosperity; they come from increased earnings, not of any particular class, not merely the great corporations, but of the daily laborer and wage earner and businessman, large and small—all under the tremendously successful policies of the President of the United States.

In fact, the totals for the 5 years of his administration show a net surplus of $1,000,000,000, notwithstanding an ill-advised reduction in taxes 3 years ago. He has got results. He has brought such comfort, such happiness, and such opportunity to the American people that no country and no people ever enjoyed before, and this under the administration of President Truman.

Oh, we can cast partisan and personal and petty reflections upon a great President, but his record is not in things said. It is in things done, in great policies carried out to successful conclusions, and in great objectives accomplished.

And he is effectively disposing of one of the most dangerous developments of our times—inflation. Inflation was hopelessly dislocating the national economy. Today fears are subsiding. Only a few weeks ago the businessmen of the Nation were in terror. Government spending, despite all these war costs, turns out not to be an inflationary force as was expected and the spiral of advancing prices is reversing. Expansive pressure occasioned by war is being deflated. March taxes run 50 percent higher against those of the taxes for the same period last year and we have a surplus instead of a deficit. The rapidity with which production proceeds, on the farm and in the factory, the direct result of the policies of the President, is building up inventories and curbing inflation at its source. What cures inflation? It is the production of goods; it is the accumulation of inventories in advance of any demand, and that is what we have today in increasing ratios. Inflation is subsiding.

And then the disagreements between labor and management. No situation could require abler statesmanship. There have been those who said that the President was a partisan—that he favored labor unduly and unfairly. And there were those who insisted he was subservient to management. But that was some time ago.

Ah, my friends, have you seen anything in the papers recently about the President favoring either labor or management? Can any one say that the President has been particularly responsible to either labor or management? What has become of all those hysterical charges bandied about so freely? Are there any strikes today? Any lockouts? Labor is receiving the greatest wage it ever earned, management is declaring record dividends. And while there are, of course, a few things about which labor and management are in disagreement, that is to be expected. No human institution is 100 percent perfect. But under the mutual cooperation of labor and management American industry is today producing the greatest amount of goods of the greatest value ever produced in this or any other country.

President Truman's administration is likewise paying a fair wage and a fair return on investment on the farm. Parity is assured by statute and neither the individual farmer nor any farm organization is urging any material change in the President's farm policy. And last, but not least, the American taxpayer has been accorded exemption from expected taxes due to a Treasury surplus derived from a surplus accumulated through increased national prosperity and decreased national spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. May I say in conclusion that judged by any criterion of national safety or national prosperity, by any yardstick of accomplishment or statesmanship, President Truman ranks today and will rank in history as one of the greatest Presidents to occupy that exalted office.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have just a word or two to say about the bill.

The budget estimates called for $843,000,000. The appropriations recommended are $478,000,000, or a cut of $364,000,000. In other words, there can be no question in my mind that the Committee on Appropriations showed in the handling of this bill some respect for the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is aware of the fact, as has been stated many times on this floor, that when the estimates come to us they are the ceiling beyond which we are not expected to go, and we are supposed to cut and expected to cut, and have always cut, as far below them as possible.

Mr. TABER. I wish that that were correct. In this particular case, I am inclined to believe it is correct. There may be individual items that someone could cut a little further, but taking it by and large, I think the committee has done a good job. There are a few items here that I want to talk about. I am not going to spend any time talking about the cut on the so-called Voice of America. I am going to leave that for whatever the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] may see fit to say. I believe the cut is thoroughly justified, that it relates to items not well thought out or well planned, and with reference to which the managers of the set-up had little if any definite, positive understanding on which an appropriation might be based.

There are a number of small items in the bill. The large item with reference to the war agencies has been cut where it could be cut.

There are some items on which there might be some dispute. But taking it by and large all of the reductions are thoroughly justified.

The item of civilian defense has been provided for in a way which, in my opinion, will take care of whatever needs there are. The sum of $186,750,000 has been allowed, which represents a cut of $216,250,000.

An emergency fund has been set up so that in the event of dire need the President might use it and might distribute it wherever it might be necessary.

Important and really necessary requirements of present protective facilities and communications equipment are provided. I believe they will be able to do the things that they need to do without any trouble. There is no question in my mind but what their recruitment program was altogether on a too liberal basis, and that they needed to have some restraint. I believe they will have money enough to do the things that need to be done.

I would like to spend a little time discussing the items of the Independent Offices appropriation where the third largest cut has been made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I notice a sentence in the report which troubles me. I wish the gentleman would speak on it. It is to be found on page 36, with reference to taking over this warning system by the civil defense authorities jeopardizing the function of the Air Force. The question I ask the gentleman is this: Is the committee satisfied that the retention of a warning system by the Air Force will not jeopardize the civilian population? Does this work both ways? Can the job be done for the civilians, though the warning system remains where it is?

Mr. TABER. The picture is this. You might just as well realize that the up-to-date method of warnings against airplanes and that sort of thing is through the use of radar. Civilian defense cannot be given that job. The use of radar is something that has to be handled by experts who are trained. I do not see how that sort of thing could in the slightest degree be turned over to any other group.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will permit me to clarify the question—because apparently my question is not clear—a warning system in the United States going to civilian centers is something which is in addition to the radar system and derives from the radar system. The question I ask is: Just what is being done on that, if we pass this bill?

Mr. TABER. There is plenty of money in the picture for those people to do anything they would need to do. There is a set-up for whatever communications might be necessary. We provided $5,000,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is there anything in the bill that is controversial, other than the item allowed for the Voice of America, and is there to be any effort generated in the committee to put back the appropriation that was deleted? In other words, as I understand, the bill originally carried an item of $90,000,000 plus for the Voice of America. Your committee, in its wisdom, cut the amount to $9,000,000. I think you were very generous in allowing that amount.

Mr. TABER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Is there any member of this committee who is interested in putting back into the bill the amount which was carried in the first instance?

Mr. TABER. I hope not. I do not know. I have not heard today whether there is or not. In the committee there was someone who talked about it.

Mr. COX. The Voice of America might be a very important adjunct to the State Department, but unfortunately we have no State Department that enjoys any measure of public confidence, and the Voice of America, because of the type of programs, is not entitled to much respect or much confidence.

Mr. TABER. We need an anti-Communist program in that Voice of America, and we are not getting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

(Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is the third supplemental appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. We have had the regular appropriation bills. We have had the first supplemental appropriation bill. We have had the second supplemental appropriation bill. We are now considering the third supplemental appropriation bill, which, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has pointed out, originally included requests for over $843,000,000.

Your committee recommends appropriations in the amount of $478,000,000, a reduction of over $365,000,000, or approximately 43 percent.

I think this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of policies which the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations have pursued in recent years, America today is confronted on the one hand by the armed might of the Communist Government of Russia and its satellites, and on the other hand by an enormous and increasing national debt, carrying with it the threat of destructive, Nation-wide inflation.

We are left between the two horns of a dilemma.

We must spend and spend heavily in order to make America powerful, in order to make our allies powerful, as the best possible insurance against world war III, as the best possible guaranty of victory if anyone should be foolhardy enough to precipitate war with America. On the other hand, we must eliminate all nonessential expenditure, we must defer every cent of expenditure that can be deferred, we must do everything in our power to eliminate the danger of inflation, which could destroy us from within.

I think the hearings on this bill are interesting in showing the program, and the progress realized by the defense mobilization organization, in the face of this twofold problem.

Generally speaking, the organization has been largely completed; plans have been prepared; specifications have to some extent been written; and the placing of orders has begun.

Time does not permit going into detail as to the defense mobilization organization.

I may mention in passing, however, that at the top of the organization is the Office of Defense Mobilization under Mr. Wilson, a small office with 50 or 60 people financed to date by $200,000 from the President's emergency fund.

Under that office on the one hand is the Defense Production Administration under General Harrison and on the other hand the Economic Stabilization Agency under Mr. Eric Johnston. General Harrison is Mr. Wilson's deputy in reference to production. Mr. Johnston is Mr. Wilson's deputy in reference to stabilization.

Much of the work of the organization is to be handled by the regular agencies of the Government. Twelve different agencies, most of them regular agencies, are included in the requests made for the work of the defense mobilization organization.

The requests of these 12 agencies amounted to $51,000,000. Your committee recommends an appropriation of $38,000,000, a reduction of $13,000,000, giving a total of about $68,000,000, including previous funds for the present fiscal year.

You will find at page 33 of the committee report a breakdown of the recommendations made in respect to each one of these agencies. You will note that requested appropriations are not only cut but that the amount allowed in many instances is divided between a part which is to be covered by appropriation and the balance which the committee expects the agency to absorb.

I may also mention in passing that in addition to the new functions which the regular agencies of Government are expected to assume, there have been created the National Production Authority with a contemplated force of between 7,000 and 8,000 functioning in the role that the War Production Board filled during World War II; also the Defense Transportation Administration with a contemplated personnel of about 230 playing the role that the ODT played in World War II; also the Wage Stabilization Board with a contemplated personnel of about 2,000, and the Office of Price Stabilization playing the part played by OPA in World War II with about 3,300 people at the present time and a contemplated over-all force of 16,200.

I want also to emphasize, that the Defense Production Act with a view to assisting the expansion of production made provision for accelerated tax amortization; for loan guaranties; and for direct loans, purchase agreements, and the installation of Government-owned equipment and plant facilities.

The record shows that to date something like $2,700,000,000 of accelerated tax amortization on the basis of 20 percent per year has been authorized through 600 certificates. It indicates also about $128,000,000 in loan guaranties and, further, that it is contemplated that about $1,600,000,000 will be made available during the present fiscal year either by direct loans, by purchase agreements or by the installation of Government-owned equipment and plant facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization represents an enormous sum of money. It can have a tremendous effect on our economy. It offers a tremendous opportunity for waste, for favoritism, and even for corruption.

It can be justified only as an emergency matter. In the light of recent developments in the National Government the greatest possible care must be utilized in making funds available.

Now, what about the twofold problem confronting the defense mobilization organization?

Mr. Wilson is optimistic in respect to essential production.

He indicates that we are moving about as fast as he thinks is practicable without undue injury to our economy as a whole. In the month of January last orders were placed to the extent of $5,700,000,000. He looks forward before long to a gross national production of above three hundred and twenty-five billion, fifty-odd billion of the total to be for defense purposes. He believes this can be done by utilizing about 20 percent of our gross national production for defense purposes as compared with 45 percent utilized during World War II.

In his report of April 1 Mr. Wilson is also optimistic in reference to the progress being made by our allies overseas.

He refers to the threat of economic collapse in Western Europe 3 years ago. He states that as of the end of 1950 industrial production in Western Europe was at 140 percent of prewar production and that agricultural production for the current year is expected to amount to 110 percent of prewar production. He states that military production has doubled since the approval of the North Atlantic Treaty. He believes it will be doubled again in the current year. He adds that under MDAP this country has furnished to more than 20 nations in Western Europe something like $6,500,000,000.

What about the other side of the picture—stabilization?

If I understood the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] correctly, he asserted a brand-new philosophy. I understood him to say that this administration has licked inflation and that from this point on we can anticipate deflation.

Mr. Wilson, director of Defense Mobilization, with his great experience, does not seem to share that point of view. I quote from Mr. Wilson:

> The production side of our task is in many ways the less difficult. A tougher test of our ability to survive the present crisis lies on the other side of the problem—stabilization.
>
> The success of our production effort demands that we win the battle against inflation.
>
> If we get run-away inflation then I am sure that Stalin will win.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this thought is emphasized repeatedly by others who appeared before the committee. It is apparent from their testimony that the steps which have been taken to date are entirely inadequate, and that the problem must be attacked from all possible directions through a comprehensive program.

Incidentally, it is perfectly clear that it is considered that price controls in and of themselves are not sufficient and that they will prove to be ineffective in the long run in the absence of proper controls over credit, over currency, and over Federal spending.

Mr. DiSalle, Director of Office of Price Stabilization, had this to say:

> I have said many times that price controls will not defeat inflation in and of themselves. * * * Price controls will never do the job alone.

Mr. Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Director, had this to say:

> I do not think you can hold this for a protracted period of time—I do not care what Mr. DiSalle does—unless you have a sound fiscal and monetary policy.
>
> We have largely financed what we have done up to now by depreciating your insurance, your money, and everything else.
>
> There isn't a prayer in hades of doing the thing unless you can achieve a reasonably balanced budget in a reasonable length of time.

Mr. Chairman, we all know we are confronted by an enormous national debt of something like $257,000,000,000. We know that we are facing the possibility of huge deficits. We know that until recently, at any rate, this administration has insisted upon a policy of low interest rates; upon a policy of supporting Government bonds at par or better; upon a policy of compelling the issue of credit to currency against those bonds.

We are advised that there are some $27,000,000,000 worth of currency in circulation at this time; that there has been an increase of $8,500,000,000 in commercial loans since the Korean War started; that in the year 1950 $250,000,000 worth of E bonds were redeemed in excess of those issued by the Government; and that in the month of January alone there was an excess of bonds redeemed over those issued of some $90,000,000, equivalent to an excess of $1,080,000,000 on a 12-month basis.

Prices showed "a rather meteoric increase," according to Mr. DiSalle, Director of Price Stabilization, during the months of November, December, and January.

Prices since the outbreak in Korea have risen 43 percent on the commodity index, 15 percent at wholesale, and 7 percent at retail.

Inflationary pressures are expected to increase tremendously in the next fiscal year because of increased Government expenditures.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the dollar today has a purchasing power of 55.1 as compared with 99.8 in 1940. The value last June was 58.3.

It is amazing, Mr. Chairman, that more was not done and done promptly after the Defense Production Act was passed on September 8, 1950, turning over enormous powers to the President. The record indicates that except for regulations on a voluntary basis, which Mr. Johnston says "My predecessor tried with rather disastrous results," no step whatever was taken in the field of price control from September 8, 1950, to January 25, 1951, 4½ months, in spite of the rather meteoric increase on prices referred to.

It is also amazing, Mr. Chairman, to see the attitude of agency after agency appearing before your committee.

Generally speaking, every agency that appeared before the committee was willing to contribute to national defense, provided the committee did not reduce its regular Government activities and provided it received additional funds for additional people.

Instance after instance will be found in the hearings of failure or refusal to economize on regular activities.

Transfers from regular functions to defense functions have been very few, indeed, and in large part when made have been made at increased ratings.

Mr. Riley, Chief of the Construction Statistics Division of the Labor Department, when asked how much his division had returned to the Treasury, said: "Well, we have not—it seems to me that all of the data we are producing is a basic function."

Mr. Ratcliff, Research Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, when asked why his and similar divisions needed extra funds to do defense work, said: "Well, the only option would have been to abandon a part of their work."

Mr. Dodson, budget officer of the Labor Department, when asked about any curtailments, said:

The entire work we are doing in the Department of Labor is of a nature that becomes more important during an emergency.

Mr. Kilguss, Deputy Administrative Assistant Attorney General, admitted that not a single employee in the Justice Department had been transferred to defense activities.

Mr. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings Service, when asked whether any departments had given up space for defense purposes, replied:

Not as yet. Not enough, that is, to make an impression upon my memory.

These responses are typical, Mr. Chairman.

Your committee has inserted language in the bill which makes provision for such transfers from regular activities of each department and agency as may be required to carry out national defense activities assigned to that department or agency. The committee expects that, in preparing estimates for fiscal year 1952 for activities under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, or other defense activities, the Bureau of the Budget will instruct all departments and agencies of the Government to adhere to the policy recommended herein of absorbing the costs of such activities, or of otherwise contributing to defense efforts.

Recently, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Joint Economic Report, consisting of eight Democrats and six Republicans, called for a slow-down in nondefense spending by the Truman administration to stop galloping inflation.

We cannot—

The committee said—

permit the cost of living to continue to rise, nor can we pile a new national defense debt on top of the unpaid debt of World War II without creating the very conditions upon which the dictators of the Kremlin are relying to destroy the economic basis of this Government and thereby the hope of a free world.

Mr. Chairman, the battle against inflation has not been won. If the battle is to be won, every agency in the executive branch of the Government must play its part. As a matter of fact, the executive branch of the Government should set the example.

Every agency must eliminate nonessential expenditures. Every agency must defer work that can be deferred. Business as usual is impossible; complacency can prove disastrous.

Inflation can weaken and destroy us from within. We must do everything in our power to overcome it. Never before was it more important to maintain a strong and powerful America.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, before referring to one of the most controversial items in the bill, if we are to believe the press and radio, the matter of the appropriations request for the so-called Voice of America, I wish to discuss one or two of the other items contained in chapter 3 of this third supplemental appropriation bill for 1951 fiscal year now pending before you for your consideration and approval or disapproval.

The first is with regard to the Civil Aeronautics Board, wherein the Committee allowed the full amount presently requested, to wit, $25,000, to finish out the Board's activities in fiscal year 1951. It will be recalled that a year ago this subcommittee in connection with the regular annual appropriation request for the Civil Aeronautics Board saw fit to cut that request of $4,323,000 at that time to $3,500,000, a reduction in funds to the extent of $823,000. At that time, as now in the case of the Voice of America, a great part of the press of this country was highly critical of the committee's action. They said we were ruining and gutting the life out of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I should like to specifically point out to you certain testimony given before this subcomittee on this very pending bill, at page 348 of the hearings, with regard to the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Board, following our cut of a year ago to the extent of $823,000.

I asked the following question:

How is that alleged imposing backlog coming along?

We suspected, may I interpolate here, that at that time the backlog was a phony carried for the purpose of getting dollars out of the Treasury by way of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

Mr. Delos W. Rentzel, who is the present and able chairman of the Board, gave this answer:

Mr. RENTZEL. We admit some of it was paper backlog. We are trying to get rid of those. A lot of those cases are cases which were filed for defensive reasons.

Mr. ROONEY. You are not trying to flatter the committee, are you, Mr. Rentzell, by pointing out that a lot of the backlog was paper backlog? We were the first to suspect that.

Mr. RENTZEL. I am aware of your criticisms and I might say that we took the committee report last year and attempted to meet each one of them that we could. I was going to explain that some of the applications on hand are for defensive reasons, defensive cases, which have been filed by the carriers to protect themselves in the event someone else filed for a particular route. We are trying to get rid of those by asking the carriers to drop the cases by more clearly defining policy, which would eliminate a lot of cases that are filed for reasons of lack of understanding of the policy.

Mr. ROONEY. It is quite amazing that last year you requested $4,323,000, and when I say you, I mean the then Chairman of the Board, requested $4,323,000 and the Congress saw fit to allow you only the amount of $3,500,000, a reduction, a terrible and deplorable reduction of $823,000 and now we find out that the organization is functioning quite well.

Mr. RENTZEL. I can only say one thing, Mr. Chairman. You can make any agency function on any amount of money. It depends on what the workload is.

Mr. ROONEY. You have just told us how well you were getting along and how that backlog was disappearing.

Mr. RENTZEL. We hope it will continue to disappear.

I bring this to your attention in connection with the present newspaper and radio criticism of the action of the committee in regard to the requested appropriation for the Voice of America. Mostly all cuts in appropriation requests cause public clamor but many save the taxpayers' dollars.

Secondly, I should like to invite your attention to the fact that the committee has seen fit to cut the appropriation requested for the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the amount of $400,000. This cut will not interfere whatever with the increased work and better operations of the great Federal Bureau of Investigation, for which Bureau and its capable Director and staff the committee has the highest regard and respect. The money allowed, to wit, $6,147,000, will permit this important Bureau to continue until the end of the current fiscal year on a 6-day week. We have also allowed in this appropriation funds for the services of 1,260 new agents and 1,373 new clerks. The cut of $400,000 is directed at only one matter, the matter of a request for 945 new and additional automobiles with equipment for each, such as two-way radios, and so on. The committee has seen fit to furnish funds for 700 new automobiles, and I am given to understand that there will be no controversy with regard to this cut since that number is sufficient to provide automobiles for the new agents hereinbefore mentioned.

Now, with regard to the so-called Voice of America, so that you understand this matter clearly, I wish to read to you from the report of the committee. This matter has been entirely misrepresented in the press and on the radio. We are not in favor of weakening the Voice of America. If you will turn to page 7 of the committee report you will find the following:

International information and educational activities: In the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951," $41,288,000, the full amount of the budget request at that time, was allowed for "Establishment of radio facilities." It was then represented that this amount plus $3,399,184 previously provided, would be sufficient to complete construction of seven certain radio construction projects designated as Able, Baker, East, Dog, Cast, John, and Jade. The present supplemental budget request in the amount $97,500,000 includes the sum of $9,533,939 represented

to the committee as being required to meet price and cost increases to complete these facilities. The remainder of the requested $97,500,000 (plus $1,000,000 previously placed in reserve under sec. 1214) was asked for construction of 13 additional radio facilities.

Testimony before the committee indicated that lack of proper planning, poor management, and avoidable delays in the execution of plans and contracts have been considerable factors occasioning the necessity of the request for over $9,500,000 additional for the above projects for which $44,687,184 in appropriations have already been made.

The testimony also indicated that all of the sites for the requested 13 new and additional facilities for which $88,966,061 was requested, have not as yet been selected. In fact, the committee was informed that no definite determinations have yet been made as to the countries in which some of these proposed facilities would be located. It was further testified that a number of these planned facilities might be located on ships, although, on questioning, the committee was given only vague and incomplete estimates of the number and the costs of such facilities as compared with land installations. Field tests of the transmitters proposed for the planned facilities have not as yet been made. Such tests are now scheduled to be made this month. The material submitted to the committee in support of the estimate lacked definiteness and was so devoid of specific data that it could not be considered a plan of action.

The so-called Voice of America has received the support of this committee since its inception. The committee fully believes in a strong, effective Voice of America. It feels that there is a great need for combating the insidious propaganda emanating from the Kremlin by making the truth available to those behind the iron curtain and to mankind the world over. It wholeheartedly believes that, properly managed and directed, the Voice of America is the best medium for accomplishment of a campaign of truth that has yet been conceived. However, the committee must say that it is very much disappointed in the accomplishments and progress made to date. Mismanagement and poor planning with regard both to the engineering and to the administrative phases of the program have cost valuable time as well as dollars.

In view of the foregoing facts, the committee is including only the amount $9,533,939 in this bill to permit completion of the seven projects previously authorized and for which considerable sums have already been expended or obligated. It hopes that the Department will exert every effort to complete these projects at the earliest possible date, take the necessary steps to overcome the weaknesses set forth in this report, and return to the Congress as soon as possible with a more intelligent and better planned program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. In the meeting of the full Committee on Appropriations last Friday I gave specific instances of grossly improper management, where taxpayers' dollars were just thrown down the drain pipe by the people in charge of this program. At that time I merely recounted two or three instances, and I am prepared on this floor today to furnish you with quite a few more that would be appalling. I do not have the time to go into them at the moment in view of this limited debate. If an amendment should be offered to this bill to increase the funds, I can assure the members of this Committee of the Whole that we will have on hand the facts and figures with which to defeat such proposed amendment. I doubt that such an amendment will be offered when the bill is read paragraph by paragraph under the 5-minute rule.

I want to point out that in the full Committee on Appropriations there were only three votes on a roll call in favor of an amendment pending before that committee which would have reinstated the entire $97,500,000. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] are quite conversant with this program, and we do not need any so-called experts or advisers to get together hurried reports on the eve—yea, over this very week end, to claim that the people running this program are, as far as they know, the ablest administrators in Government. We do not need that at all. We have the facts. We know this program. This is the sixth year in which I have sat as a member of this subcommittee handling appropriations for the Department of State and I think I know something about it.

As far as the editorials and the abuse heaped upon the committee for its action in this matter in insisting that we know what we are buying with the taxpayers' dollars, I can take that abuse, as far as that is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk on all phases of the third supplemental appropriations, dealing with the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, but time will not permit me to cover all of those agencies.

However, the appropriation of nearly a half a billion dollars is a lot of money, but the fact that the committee has made very substantial reductions will bring some hope to the people, to the taxpayers of the United States. Lenin's statement to the effect that Russia would not to fight America but that America would destroy itself by going bankrupt, means something.

I want to confine myself to what is alleged to be a controversial item in this bill, namely, the appropriation for our Information Service, a service which we are hoping to strengthen and make effective, in order to bring the truth about America to the world. The hearings on this deficiency bill are clear as to what we have previously appropriated and what we propose doing in making this Voice of America strong.

In the past few years we have appropriated over $225,000,000 for this Information Service. With requests that are being made now for the next fiscal year, including the money we are appropriating here, $9,500,000, the program is starting toward a point where future spending will be more than 50 percent of all State Department activities.

The people in the United States know something about this Information Service, for the agency has made over 375 speeches all over the United States in 17 months telling the people of how the United States how good the Voice of America, the Information Service, is. So the people of the United States are informed.

These hearings "Supplemental Appropriations for the Department of State, Information Service," will show you that they are requesting another $115,000,000 for next year. There is really no real lack of funds.

Your committee has lived with this thing many years, ever since its inception, as your chairman has said. We are friendly to the program; we want to make it effective; we are not trying to scuttle it. We gave the Voice of America every cent they asked for last year to stop Russian jamming. The Information Service is engaged in various activities: Motion pictures, exchange of students and professors, libraries, and so forth. But what we were up against last year was the fact that the Russians had started a jamming operation of our radio transmitters which were sending messages of truth to Russia. So the request here is for more money for more radio transmitters to overcome this jamming. The scientists and experts of MIT who came before us said they had made a survey, that they needed more radio stations to make our voice more powerful in the hope of overcoming this jamming, and we are giving them $9,500,000 in addition to what they have got now which they have not expended, in order to catch up with their antijamming operations. These experts say there is no real cure for jamming; that we can spend this money and get one step ahead of the Russians, but they have another additional plan. The hearings will disclose that if the Russians spend dollar for dollar with the United States they can perhaps continue effectively with their jamming operations. To make effective our information service there should be coordination. This Information Service of the Department of State is not the only Voice of America we have. The ECA and the Marshall plan are spending many millions of dollars for a similar program. HICOG also has a program. There is duplication in several instances. There is a program up in Massachusetts; there is also a program in the United Nations, the sounding board over which we have apparently no control. We are not in psychological warfare yet, but your committee is endeavoring to set this up to be available to the Armed Services when and if they need psychological warfare.

Four or five Voices of America uncoordinated is took big a job to disregard. The Russian delegates to the United Nations, where there is a United Nations program, use that as a sounding board to preach communism, not only in all parts of the world but also here

in the United States, by the voice; by the spoken word, by the visual picture of television and motion pictures. Our rebuttal is very weak. We need a coordinated program which we must put into effect. As of now the State Department is handicapped by too much duplication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I warn you that this Congress has to bring confidence back to America by coordinating all our efforts to make friends all over the world. Let us coordinate the efforts of our agencies now operating all over the world if we want to bring friendship and confidence to America.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman give us his estimate as to the relative effectiveness of the two main programs you have described? Which is doing the better job—the ECA program or the regular Department of State program?

Mr. STEFAN. The Department of State.

Mr. JUDD. It is doing the better job?

Mr. STEFAN. In my opinion.

Mr. JUDD. Everything that the gentleman and others have said here today in criticism of the information program was said in the debate 4 years ago when we passed the Voice of America bill. In the gentleman's opinion, why is it that this program somehow or other has not succeeded in doing well the job that everybody wants it to do? What is the reason for it?

Mr. STEFAN. I could stand up here for an hour and give you my own opinions, but unless you eliminate this duplication, the program cannot be effective.

Mr. JUDD. But why has it not been able to gain the confidence of other people and win respect and good will for our country?

Mr. STEFAN. With the money we are spending for personnel we should be able to employ the highest type of propagandists in the world. But there should not be too many different Voices of America competing with one another.

Mr. JUDD. That is the point, the Congress has furnished the money but still somehow or other an effective job is not being done. What is the trouble?

Mr. STEFAN. This committee does not want to administer. We will constructively criticize when the time comes. I am merely giving the facts as they came before the committee. You who are members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs should know what I am talking about.

Mr. JUDD. I do know and I have struggled with it in that committee. I am asking the gentleman's opinion because I know he has given a great deal of time and careful attention to the problem, and there is nothing that disturbs both him and me more than our obvious inadequacies in this field, and I wanted the benefit of his judgment.

Mr. STEFAN. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, that time will come when we bring to the House the regular requests for next year's funds which will be tremendous. I am merely making these statements to persuade the newspapers and the public that we are not trying to scuttle this program but instead, are trying to strengthen it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

(Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I think for a moment I will try to put my finger on what I think is wrong with this information service. What we have lacked is a real directing head for the Voice of America. We have lacked, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said, a State Department in which the American people have confidence, first and last. It is a project, in my opinion, which should have a sharp shooter and not a burp-gun operator. The trouble that every one of our general representatives in the capitals of Europe is finding is that much of this stuff that is released is literally poison in the country which it reaches. Certainly we must have propaganda with every word carefully weighed, because, after all, the Voice of America should weigh a ton. It should have weight where it goes. It should go into the countries of the world more or less as news and not as Government propaganda. We will find, as we found in Iran, that we could not maintain over 30 minutes of propaganda in 24 hours without more pressure from her neighbors than she could withstand. And the pattern of material that we have been putting out is highly provocative. It furnishes a more perfect background for a Russian attack on us than you could possibly conceive.

I just want to read a few lines from a Senate report to give you a bearing on this. This is from Brussels, and it is Senator GREEN speaking—Senate Document No. 16:

> It is necessary here as elsewhere, however, to have an adequate answer to Soviet propagandists who talk constantly about the dangers of western imperialism, about consequences of German rearmament, and about that awful country, the United States, with its low culture, race discrimination, and gangsterdom.
>
> In high authoritative quarters particular concern was expressed lest our information program might be giving aid and comfort to the enemy by showing too much of the bad or seamy side of American life. Said one high United States official in Brussels:
>
> "We seem to feel that we must give the whole picture, all the good and all the bad. Very sensational news material comes abroad which oftentimes paints the United States in a very bad light. Whereas Soviet policy is to play up, and not to play down, the Soviet way of life. Can we afford to be so objective at this critical moment? Can't we at least emphasize more of the positive side, since all the world is not so open-minded in its appraisal of news as, say, the average American at home?"

That is the end of the quotation from that official, but Senator GREEN continues:

> Members of the delegation felt this point was extremely well taken and in line with current United States information needs abroad.
>
> Following conferences with heads of state and leaders of government in 16 countries and dependencies, members of the delegation are strongly of the opinion that we have been losing the cold-war battle up to now, and that we should speedily do something about it. Indeed, it is imperative that we do so.

A little further in their report they state:

> We found ample evidence that our Voice of America, our State Department, and American foreign policy have not been successful in meeting the Communist propaganda.
>
> The tensions and the problems we saw resolve themselves into a battle for the minds of men. Our failures in the area of psychological warfare are to be contrasted with undeniable Communist successes. The contrast calls for redoubled efforts by this country in this area. We can learn much from the basic Communist technique, which transmits its propaganda through native minds and native tongues. A basic recommendation is complete reorientation of the United States Information Service, and particularly the Voice of America. Without decreasing the effective scope of the information program, it is suggested that no less than the funds now expended for the program be directed to a decentralized program, which will function primarily through or in conjunction with the diplomatic missions within the various countries involved. This is designed to achieve maximum efficiency of effort and maximum results by pin-pointing objectives.
>
> As firmly and as candidly as possible members of the delegation attempted at every formal and informal conference to state the attitude of the American people toward world issues—as we understand that attitude. We felt that our plain speaking was appreciated at all times. We believe that our international position has suffered from a lack of candor and plain speaking on the part of some emissaries and policymakers. Differences inevitably occur among peoples, but in the present atmosphere of tension and uncertainty throughout the world these differences are best resolved on a basis of candor and plain speaking.

That is a report signed by Senator GREEN and Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan.

If we oppose at all the wasteful expenditure of tens of millions of dollars of American money, we must face attack from this kept press and these sentimentalists who think you can buy this stuff by the yard, just as so many of them think you can buy cancer research the same way. We must, as members of the committee, lay ourselves open to attack. None know it better than I, because they carried it right into my home town in the week before election this last year, picturing me as a penny-pinching Congressman who wanted to choke off this program with a miserable pittance. Those were the words they used. Out in our country $34,000,000 is not a miserable pittance yet. It may end that way if our money keeps on depreciating. But I say to you with all the candor and all the sincerity I have within me that I think $34,000,000, which we gave them in 1950 and 1951 less supplementals, was plenty of money. If the program is condensed, if it is carefully weighed and carefully considered, and then presented to people who will absorb it, who will throw just mere propaganda out of the window, it will be a success. How would you like it if some-

body set up a nuisance like that in your back yard, with one of these 24-hour broadcasting systems, where if you turn on your radio you either got Russian jamming or American windjamming? As between the two, it does not take very much to go around with me.

I want to see my country's policies carefully enunciated by the State Department. I want the voice of the State Department to carry that message to the world, but I want every word we utter carefully weighed, and I want us to quit this burp-gun operation all over the world, and get on the target. Let us get an American foreign policy determined by a State Department the people believe and trust, and then let the Voice of America take it to the world, preferably initiated into the regular newscasts, not as blatant propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

FISCAL SERVICE

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

For additional amounts for "Collector's Office," fiscal year 1949, $653,568, and fiscal year 1951, $144,700.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a committee of the other body is beginning hearings in Mississippi today following charges of illegal sales of patronage jobs by an outlaw self-styled committee headed by one Clarence Hood. This is the same Mr. Hood who, only several weeks ago, was ousted by the Democratic National Committee as Democratic committeeman from Mississippi following revelation of the charges. Mr. Hood has, for some time, been under fire for his participation in the sale of these Government jobs and other alleged corrupt practices in Mississippi.

It was interesting to note from a news item appearing in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News under date of Thursday, April 5, that Mr. Hood, who will be called to testify before the committee, had retained the services of one Paul Dillon, a Missouri lawyer. Mr. Dillon, according to this newspaper story, is, and I quote: "Well known as a tax attorney."

It may be wondered why Mr. Hood, a Mississippian, saw fit to secure the services of a St. Louis lawyer, when Mississippi can boast of hundreds of competent, able, and honest attorneys. Further reflection, however, will make perfectly obvious Mr. Hood's reasons for retaining Mr. Dillon.

The name of Paul Dillon, Missouri lawyer, runs through these nauseous Mississippi scandals like a silken thread through a tapestry. It is a matter of public knowledge that Mr. Dillon was instrumental 2 years ago in setting up Mr. Hood and his committee and having them recognized by the National Democratic Committee to the exclusion of Mississippi's legally elected Democratic committee.

Mr. Dillon's participation in the Mississippi scandals is not surprising, however, in view of his background.

He is a professional string puller. He is also the same notorious underworld fixer whose reputed influence opened the doors of the Federal penitentiaries and permitted members of the Capone criminal mob to return to freedom. House Report No. 2441 of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Eightieth Congress, shows that this man Dillon received a fee of $10,000 for securing the parole of Louis Campagna, one of Capone's henchmen. This report will show further that Dillon acted as attorney in fact and go-between for the rest of the Capone mob, many of whom were later granted paroles. This report shows that Dillon is a man of shady character, an underworld mouthpiece and associate of criminals, and a notorious influence peddler. It is possible that his first association with Mississippi affairs came about in 1947. He was a close friend and ally with one Edward Terry, Mississippi's most notorious Judas Iscariot, who, while serving as confidential assistant to Senator Bilbo, admitted having accepted $15,000 from a group of eastern radicals to betray and act as an informer against his employer. Mississippians will never forget Mr. Terry's intrigue nor his loathsome betrayal of the trust placed in him by his cancer-ridden employer any more than they will ever forget the role played by this odious St. Louis lawyer who acted as go-between for Mr. Terry in his nefarious activities. It will also be recalled that Mr. Dillon became attorney for Mr. Terry when the Senate committee investigating the election campaign of Senator Bilbo uncovered this payment of $15,000. It is significant that while Mr. Dillon was acting as Mr. Terry's attorney before the Bilbo investigating committee members of the committee stated publicly that Mr. Dillon's client had committed perjury before them. Somehow, Mr. Terry was never brought to trial on these charges of perjury.

Following Mr. Terry's betrayal of the dying Senator Bilbo, he became an associate of Clarence Hood in the lumber business at Meridian, Miss. It was through this development that Dillon became acquainted with Hood, and this marks the beginning of Dillon's meddling into Mississippi political affairs.

Although Mr. Dillon now sets himself up as a tax lawyer, and purports to be an expert lawyer in matters coming before the Internal Revenue Department, it is a fact that he is not even allowed to practice before that agency. It is a matter of record that he is the same Paul Dillon who, in 1949 applied for permission to practice as a tax attorney before the Treasury Department. After the Department had made its usual investigation it was determined that his application should be denied because of his unsavory character and shady record. The investigation was made by the St. Louis office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, intelligence unit, and he was denied his permit on the basis of an unfavorable character report. Details of this action on the part of the Treasury Department can be found in a report appearing on page 2, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 6, 1951, issue, as well as other newspapers throughout the country. After Dillon was denied permission to practice before the Treasury Department, he was given an opportunity to appear and refute the findings of the investigation. He declined to pursue the matter further. It is apparent that Dillon was willing to let well enough alone because his record would not stand the light of truth.

It is a fact that any attorney who is in good standing with the his bar association, and who is considered to be of good character, can qualify to practice before the Treasury and other Government agencies. Mr. Dillon would not meet this test of ethics and character.

I have it on reliable authority that this man has also been put on the blacklist of the Justice Department because of his associations and activities in connection with gangsters and public corruption.

If a lawyer must have a reasonably good character to practice before Government agencies and courts, the same qualifications should be met before he is allowed to practice before a congressional committee. The Committee on Practice of the Treasury Department has investigated, decreed, and adjudged that Dillon is not of good moral character and has refused his permit to practice before the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Justice Department apparently feels the same way. He is a rascal, an underworld character, a fixer, an influence peddler, and has been publicly branded as such by Government agencies and congressional committees.

The committee now making the investigation of these job sales in Mississippi should look into Mr. Dillon's background and his association with the so-called Hood committee.

And I might add that on the new ticker a few moments ago I saw where testimony had been adduced from this committee in Mississippi that would indicate that Mr. Dillon himself acted as the go-between between Mr. Hood and his group in Mississippi and the Democratic Committee in Washington in furnishing these Government jobs. Everywhere Dillon has gone, scandal has followed. Everything that he has touched has become odious. He reeks with the vile stench of organized crime. He is a known influence peddler and backroom fixer. Corruption and rascality constitute his chief stock in trade.

Therefore, I respectfully urge the investigating committee of the other body, now in Mississippi, to make a thorough investigation of this infamous carpetbagger and his connection with recent political affairs in Mississippi.

Under leave to extend by remarks, I include the afore-mentioned news re-

port taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 6, 1951:

PAUL DILLON'S REQUEST TO PRACTICE BEFORE TREASURY DEPARTMENT IS REJECTED—ST. LOUISAN INTERCEDED IN PAROLES OF FOUR CAPONE MEN IN 1948—UNFAVORABLE REPORT

Paul Dillon, St. Louis attorney who interceded for four Chicago Capone gangsters in obtaining paroles in 1948, has been turned down on his application to practice before the United States Treasury Department, it was disclosed today.

John L. Graves, chairman of the Department's committee on practice, told a Post-Dispatch reporter at Washington that an unfavorable report had been received on Dillon's application. The investigation was made for the Department by the St. Louis office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue intelligence unit.

Graves said Dillon was offered a chance for a hearing on the information contained in the report but had never accepted it. The offer has been open since last September 25, when the committee formally disapproved the application.

SAYS HE WITHDREW REQUEST

Dillon said here today that he does not intend to pursue further his attempt to be approved for practice before the Department. He insisted, however, that he withdrew his application before it was turned down. No record of the withdrawal is in the Department's files.

"I'll be 74 my next birthday, and that's too old to be running to Washington and other places throughout the country in connection with tax matters, which would be the only business before the Department," Dillon said.

Dillon's application was filed October 11, 1949. He received a "temporary recognition card," which entitled him to practice before the Department and its numerous bureaus, including Internal Revenue, while an investigation was conducted to determine if an enrollment certificate would be issued. Graves explained such procedure was standard with all applicants.

A statute requires that a certificate be issued only to attorneys who are in good standing with their bar organizations and are of "good character and repute."

INQUIRY DETAILS CONFIDENTIAL

Details in the investigation report are confidential, but it was considered a certainty that intelligence unit agents included information on Dillon's activities in behalf of the four Capone gangsters—Louis (Little New York) Campagna, Paul (the Waiter) Ricca, Charles (Cherry Nose) Gioe and Philip D'Andrea. Three of the paroles were revoked and two of the men have been returned to prison.

Testimony before a congressional subcommittee later revealed that Dillon received $10,000 for his services for the gangsters. Dillon was St. Louis campaign manager for President Truman when the latter was running for the Senate. He also was attorney for former Sheriff John F. Dougherty, now chief clerk for the magistrate's court.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the committee for giving the people of this great country a ray of hope in bringing this bill to the House with the reductions which appears in the committee report. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill, and I hope that future appropriations bills that are brought in will give the Members a chance to vote for similar cuts, to the end that in the total budget that has been submitted for the coming fiscal year we can effectuate a reduction of somewhere between seven and nine billion dollars.

I propose to use a substantial part of this committee report, especially that referring to cuts, in the notice I shall send to the good people of my district, because I believe it will be some of the most favorable news they have received in many, many months in respect to the program in Washington.

On the matter of the Voice of America I wish to express my opinion. I ask this simple question: From what source did we obtain the philosophy that we have a right to stick our nose into the affairs of the other nationals of the earth as we do through that program, and attempt to tell other people what they must do, and coerce them into the following philosophy? It is not difficult for me to understand that the so-called intelligentsia of the European countries in particular look upon us as backwoodsmen still in our swaddling clothes when it comes to this question of international leadership. As near as World War I in international leadership circles we had less standing than Constantinople itself.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Instead of being the Voice of America a great deal of it sounds to me like the echo from Europe.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Regardless of what kind of echo it is, I just cannot bring myself into agreement with the program we have been following; and, certainly, the committee was justified in eliminating what has been deleted from this request insofar as the 13 new stations are concerned. I cannot find anything in the record where there was any justification of any consequence at all for these 13 new stations; so I see nothing here that should be criticized about the action taken by the committee.

Secondly, I wish to join with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in his statement to the effect that our production is the answer to men everywhere. I cannot understand why the administration and the Congress at this time refuses or declines or fails to initiate a 48-hour base pay week and thus get down to the production of goods and services and meet the requirements of this so-called emergency, police action, or war, if you want to call it war. We have gone out here and built these great productive facilities throughout the 48 States and in our territories and insular possessions, yet we go on as before. If the emergency has existed as indicated in the debate recently, and I refer to the selective-service and universal military-training bill, if the emergency is as great as the arguments presented before the Ways and Means Committee represent, if the emergency is as great as the Treasury Department tells us, as Mr. Wilson tells us, then it is high time that we took off our shirts and got down to brass tacks and produced the goods necessary to meet the opposition which seems to be developing throughout the world. If such emergency does not exist, that is a different situation. What prevents us from going on a 48-hour week is the influence of those who insist upon maintaining high costs, high ceiling prices, and more inflation. I say it is time we got busy and do all that we can do, with the blessings we have.

We face world problems which will have to be solved, if at all by world effort. We cannot do the job alone. The world will soon grow tired of our peanut program. Then what shall we do? Send the marines to coerce? I repeat, we cannot do the job alone.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker has said that if the American people understood the very splendid work this committee has done in reducing this bill by about 43 percent, or $385,000,000, it would give them more encouragement than any information which has come out of the Congress for the past number of months. I agree with that statement. I could tell when we were on the appropriation bill which was so very difficult to reduce a week or two ago that the Congress was finally responding to the will of the people demanding economy.

I hope we can continue to reduce all appropriation bills. You and I know that Government departments nearly always ask for more money than is absolutely necessary.

We should, I am sure, and I believe we can and will, reduce the President's budget by over $6,000,000,000. If we do not continue to reduce expenses drastically our Nation will become bankrupt in short order, and all will be lost. We will lose our freedom and become an easy prey to communism.

The people know, and we the Representatives of the people know, that we cannot defend this country in a great emergency unless we are strong financially. They know it is up to the Congress, the representatives of the people, to enforce economy as never before. They insist we do it. I want to congratulate this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to bring another opportunity for economy to the attention of the House. I had thought of offering an amendment to this bill which would cut back the regular annual 26-day leave to a 15-day leave. This would save manpower and reduce from 26 days for over 2,000,000 employees to 15 days, or 3 weeks, giving those in the executive departments the same amount of leave as those in the postal department.

My thought was to attach this amendment, which is the essence of a bill I introduced some months ago, to this bill, but I finally decided that inasmuch as this is a supplemental appropriation bill there would be objection raised to it in the form of a point of order and that it probably is a little premature.

I requested time to bring this matter to the attention of the Members of the Congress, however, in the hope that if we are unable to get a hearing on my bill before the Committee on Post Office and

Civil Service, so it can be brought to the House and enacted into law; when the next appropriation bill comes before this House the committee will give consideration to attaching such a provision to the bill in such broad form that it will apply to all of the appropriation bills in the future, if that is proper, and I think it is.

What will that do? It will be a painless way of saving $250,000,000. At least $250,000,000 will be unnecessarily spent unless this amendment is agreed to in the future. During the coming year the lowest possible estimate of saving will be $250,000,000 if you cut back this leave. No one will lose a job, you will have greater production from your manpower, no one's wages will be reduced, yet you will effect a minimum saving of $250,000,000 to the Government. That is quite a sum of money.

May I call attention to the fact that I happen to know of more than one instance of men in the high brackets who have cashed in their accumulated leave and have received checks for up to $4,500 and more for their accumulated leave. This bill I introduced some months ago will also stop the accumulation of leave so that leave must be taken in the fiscal year in which it is earned. It is the right way to get on to a better fiscal basis with reference to our employees in the executive department. Of course, the judicial department and the legislative department are excluded from the leave bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, it is rather astounding to note the amount of accumulated leave some of these men in the high brackets are taking, those who are drawing high salaries. I hope in the very near future to be able to give you quite a few facts along that line.

Of course, it will be said on the part of some of the Federal employees that the high cost of living has been proceeding faster than their increase in wages. Well, that is a debatable question, but if it has, we would be treating them on an equal with other people throughout the Nation as to leave if we equalize them all back to a 3 weeks' leave. Fifteen workdays would be 3 weeks' annual leave, the same as the post office employees are getting at the present time.

Do you know that there is accrued annual leave now that is a debt against the Government that we must pay out of some $581,000,000; that our Federal payroll now is $7,500,000,000 a year; and that about 10 percent of that is not earned? It goes into sick and annual leave.

We will only be asking our Federal employees to work 85 to 90 percent of the time because, in fact, we only work about 220 days a year. When they complain that their salaries need to be raised, if they need to be raised, raise them, but bring them all on an equality.

RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. Chairman, Federal employees do have some advantages. They have continuous employment year after year in addition to their annual, sick leave, eight holiday leaves a year, and a 5-day, 40-hour week. Continuous employment gives them a distinct advantage and we are glad that it does.

They participate in a rather liberal retirement fund over 50 percent of which is paid by the Government.

The employees pay into this fund 6 percent of their salary and the figures show that the Federal Government has matched that amount by putting in about 6½ percent, all of which may be looked upon as a gift or an addition to the regular salary they are getting throughout the years.

Let me illustrate this cost to the Government by using the last three fiscal years. In 1949 the Federal Treasurer contributed to the retirement fund for the employees $226,032,000; in 1950, $304,508,830; and in 1951, $307,117,455; making a total of $837,658,335 donated to the retirement fund for these Federal workers.

This amount during only the past 3 years, and in addition the Federal Treasury paid all of the administrative expenses of this retirement fund, amounting to $4,498,397.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that in the best interest of all of our splendid Federal employees and of all of the people in the Nation that this Congress should enact into law the bill I have proposed because we need desperately to effect this saving of $250,000,000, we need to put all of our Federal employees on an equality of leave and we need to keep this Nation sound financially in the interest of all of our employees and of all the 150,000,000 people we, in the Congress, represent.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC WELFARE

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For additional amounts for "St. Elizabeths Hospital," fiscal year 1949, $13,704, and fiscal year 1950, $22,604.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I have been reading a good deal in the papers lately about a possible crackdown on General MacArthur. I want to say something about that, because time moves fast, and I do not know what will happen in the next 24 hours. If there is such a crackdown, it will afford the world a classic example of disciplining a man who in his estimates of the far-eastern situation has always been right, to save the faces of people who at least with respect to that situation have always been demonstrably wrong.

If General MacArthur were given a free hand in Asia, Chiang Kai-shek's army could go to work, and the Chinese Communist tyranny of Mao Tze-tung might be overthrown. That would do more to enhance the chances of peace in Europe than anything that we are likely to be able to do for a long time in Europe itself. The United Nations with the formal encouragement of this House declared Communist China an aggressor nation. I was here as most of you were on the Friday afternoon when that resolution urging the United Nations to denounce Communist China was brought to the floor of the House in such a surprising way. I supported the resolution. Of what use was this declaration if no sanctions were to be imposed on the aggressor? Why should we not blockade the Chinese ports? There is no danger of all-out war with China if we land no troops on Chinese soil. Nor is there any chance of peace in Korea unless the United Nations Commander is freed from his shackles so as to achieve the United Nation's objective of a united and independent Korea. General MacArthur has the confidence of our people and, in my judgment, has the confidence of the majority in the Congress. I wish the administration instead of rebuking him would accept his advice.

Only a few moments ago I received a letter characteristic of a great many letters which come to me. It reads:

> This is a rush note—just as it should be.
>
> We, of this community plead to you to do all you can to help and uphold General MacArthur. Please give him full charge and authority about this Korean situation. He has proven his ability and skill as a military man. Why not depend on him now?
>
> We have faith in you and feel sure you will do all you can to see General MacArthur treated as he deserves.
>
> Your supporter,
>
> Mrs. ARMAND PAINCHAUD.

That is characteristic of many letters which I have received. I know it is characteristic of thousands of letters which come to all of you and I wish the administration would harken to them.

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I trust members of the committee will recall that we are on the floor today by sufferance, that we are on borrowed time, and that the day was formally set apart for the consideration of the draft bill. We were admitted today in order to take care of a particularly pressing emergency. Under general debate we had a fixed time, but it is

to be hoped that on the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule the Members of the House will confine debate to the bill. We invite all the discussion we can get on the bill, but pro forma amendments to strike out the last word, under which time is devoted to extraneous subjects, delay us beyond the time to which we are entitled under the permission given to meet an emergency.

I am certain members of the committee appreciate the situation and will cooperate with us in confining debate to relevant subjects germane to the bill.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I feel that if we are going to get through we ought to be very careful. I do not wish to interfere with those who have already started, but I do feel that as we go along we must stick to the language of the bill in the future, and we must close debate within reason or we will be in the way of the draft bill for the rest of the week.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], appealing to the other Members to confine their remarks to the bill. I shall come just as near, in my opinion, as the gentleman from Missouri did in his long, drawn-out speech of a few hours ago.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to abandon honesty in government, if we are to permit the corruption that has been going on to continue without a protest, then it might be all right to get up and pay tribute to individuals in or out of office, and ignore these alarming conditions.

You just heard the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] exposing the corruption that has been going on in the selection of postal appointees in Mississippi, and telling where the corrupt influences seemed to get their inspiration and support.

I have not known any man in the same length of time to give as much appalling information as my distinguished colleague [Mr. WILLIAMS] did in the few moments he had the floor. Even then he left out Tilford Dudley, whose questionable record and whose intermeddling in these affairs in Mississippi is well known.

Instead of investigating conditions in New York City, we had better investigate the corruption going on in the Federal Government. Probably nowhere in America has there been more of that corruption than there has been in the selection of postal employees in the State of Mississippi under this Dillon-Hood regime.

Not only should he investigate that, but the men on the Senate committee down there should certainly have the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Those members of the Senate committee down there today ought to have that in order that they may go to the bottom of this proposition and turn up and expose those racketeers who have been using the Government of the United States for rake-down purposes.

While I am on that subject, let me say there has never been a bigger racket, in my opinion, going on right under your noses, than this so-called Marshall plan, the Bevan plan, if you please. Look at the magazines that are drawing hundreds of thousands of dollars a year allegedly to tell Europe what America stands for. If you read them you will find that some of them do not even stand for America. Go and investigate those individuals who have made hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of dollars in rake-off under this so-called Marshall plan. The average man over there, on whose shoulders rest the burdens of his government, has never realized that the United States has sent them anything. If you do not mind, the same thing is going to happen when you go to sending this wheat to India. The Indians are now going to raise cotton because this DiSalle, or DiSalvo, order has reduced the price of cotton to $100 a bale or more below the world market. The Indians are turning their wheatlands into cotton patches and raising cotton, and begging you to send them wheat. But they do not want Canadian wheat. They say that is not good enough.

It is about time that we cleaned house and fumigated every department of this Government, from the State Department to the Bureau of the Census. It is about time that America woke up, and the Congress woke up, and investigated, instead of trying to protect certain elements that are undermining and destroying, not only our economic strength, not only our physical strength, but confidence in our Government itself.

This so-called Voice of America should be looked into. It often sounds more like a foreign echo. It seems to be the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress and to the American people at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUDITED CLAIMS

For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1948 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in House Document No. 67 (82d Cong.), $4,648.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly on the subject of the Voice of America. There has been some thought interjected into this debate this afternoon to the effect that perhaps the Voice of America is something that we should not have. I believe in the Voice of America. I believe that it may save American lives. I think it can help us win the cause which we have before us. I believe we must strengthen the Voice of America in every possible way.

The Voice of America should make a great effort to crystallize and simplify the telling of the story that we are trying to tell and the ideal which we are fighting for.

The majority of mankind today are hungry for a change. We live in a revolutionary world.

Soviet leaders seize upon this age of restlessness as a time for easy conquest. Their most potent weapon has been ideological. They are busy bribing the gatekeepers of freedom with the idea that the state by absolutely controlling the lives of all citizens can best provide people with material requirements. As Lenin said: "Marxism is materialism militant."

In the battle of ideas, communism appears to be presently winning by default, partly because of our own ideological confusion and partly because of the lack of commitment and passion on our side.

Just what is our idea? In the first place many of us think about the Voice of America as being designed to talk only of Americanism. If that be so, we may be running into some difficulties, because, if we are trying to line up the people of the world on our side, it seems to me that using the term "Americanism" as our main theme, may be alienating those to whom that term is a foreign term. How would we react to "Germanism" or "Englishism"? There are those who say that the Voice of America is supposed to be telling the story of democracy. If that be true, then we will be alienating countries which are not democratic. Also, some people say that this program is supposed to tell the story of freedom. If that be so, will not freedom by itself provide for its own destruction by allowing the choice of things which lead to self-destruction?

Our country was founded on the spirit and on the idea of freedom under God. That is the theme we should have. It is the theme which came to us from Europe as a result of the Reformation. As a result of the discovery of America, the people of the world found here a haven to worship God as they saw fit. They did not come here to be free from religion. They came to be free to worship God as they saw fit. If we in America would analyze ourselves today, I would say that our troubles are not so much concerned with the type of radio beams that we have or the articles we have in the newspapers. It is the truth that is to be told about us as we are today that is giving us trouble. It is not just in the high places in the Government. We all need to get back to the fundamentals of religion. If we overlook the fact that our country was founded on religion, on spiritual values, we will be overlooking the most fundamental thing in America.

Our earliest forefathers brought to America this idea of freedom under God. They came to Fort Caroline in the South and to Plymouth Rock in the North. They did not seek freedom from religion, but freedom of religion, freedom conditioned by the laws and influence of God. For us Americans the idea was born in Europe, but luckily for us the idea has friends in all nations, in all peoples, and in all religions throughout the world.

The real revolution that is taking place today is the striving of peoples everywhere to obtain the blessings of this fun-

damental idea, whether they have ever heard of the idea or not. The contrasting teachings of communism, atheistic materialism, are all that the Soviet dictatorship can muster to serve its reactionary counterrevolution. It will help the cause of our own revolution for us clearly and repeatedly to state our idea, freedom under God, and for us to strive constantly to live by the idea and to help others to gain its blessings.

Dispelling all confusion surrounding our cause will leave the ammunition of the ideological war within our grasp, but we will still need the spark to send the projectile to its target. The spark of our revolution must be the individual fervor, fire, and zeal of every fighter for our cause.

How does a person acquire the ability to fight in this revolution? How does he acquire the fire to attract others and win others? One cannot do it in freedom from all restraint, freedom from responsibility, freedom from discipline, and freedom from religion. One must do it by coming to grips with one's own life, confessing one's sins to God, adhering to absolute moral principles, assuming one's rightful responsibilities, and seeking and following daily guidance from God in one's own life.

Only people who have been touched and changed by God's influence can fight effectively in the front lines in today's ideological war. If a man cannot or will not humble himself and come to grips with spiritual realities, his life will probably actually serve the atheistic materialism of the enemy whether he wills it or not.

The concluding lines in our Declaration of Independence are:

> For the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

In today's historic moment I hope that every American will take that oath again and get on the front lines of the ideological war in actively supporting the revolutionary idea of freedom under God.

So, it seems to me that the Voice of America, as it tells the story of freedom under God, is a thing which is extremely important to our country. It can save our young men on battlefields. It can protect the homes and altars of this country. The fundamental thing which I would like to put across in this little talk of mine today is that I feel that it is about time that we reanalyze what we are trying to tell the world and not try to tell them about the things which are extraneous but about the main thing, which is the fact that we came here to be free to worship God as we saw fit but under God's discipline; and that our blessings have their source in these principles. We, as individuals, not only the people in Congress but the people everywhere throughout the country, must get back to these fundamental truths of spiritual reality if we are going to win this situation we have in the world today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman may have said that he was making a little speech, but I want to compliment the gentleman. He has made a really great speech.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, there is a danger in this debate today. That is that what the newspapers have been explaining to the country may find confirmation in this House, and the idea may be entertained by the people that if the House goes along with the committee in what they have done, in making this very drastic cut, that means that the House has turned down the Voice of America; that it does not think it is a good idea, and therefore has shown that to the country by cutting it 90 percent. Nothing could be a greater disservice to the people.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will just let me finish my thought and then I will ask him a question.

I might say to the gentleman that he has said in this report, and I think sincerely, and I think he will demonstrate it in a minute when I ask him a question, that the Voice of America has received the support of this committee since its inception. I know that to be true and I know the gentleman to be sincere about it.

There are three means by which we are trying to defeat communism in the world.

One is military. Unfortunate, sad, costly, and extremely difficult.

The other is economic, which is just as necessary, although some here disagree with me; and the third is ideological. That is what the Voice of America is for. It is possible to produce evidence to the effect that the Voice of America does not get through the iron curtain adequately; that it is jammed; also that there are relatively few sets in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, China, and so on. That is true, but the Voice of America is also doing a tremendous job where there is freedom of speech and where there are radio sets. That applies to something in the area of over a billion people in the world. Let us never forget that we do not want to bare the breasts of 150,000,000 Americans standing alone, without allies, to attack by the Russians and their satellites, 800,000,000 strong. We want allies that will act to prevent attack and to help meet it if it comes. The Voice of America and its programs represent an effort to convince our allies, too.

As I understand it, the reason the committee has turned down this $89,000,000 request is not because they do not agree with the Voice of America program, not because they are not back of it or want to cripple it, but because what was presented to justify this appropriation was half-baked. The committee has said so in the report. They say, and I would like to read that:

> The committee hopes that the Department will exert every effort to complete these projects at the earliest possible date, take the necessary steps to overcome the weaknesses set forth in this report, and return to the Congress as soon as possible with a more intelligent and better planned program.

That implies that if they do the committee will be sympathetic with their request for money to implement their program. I ask the chairman whether I have read the views of a majority of the committee correctly in this report?

Mr. ROONEY. Of course. The gentleman knows that I read the report into the RECORD, but does not the gentleman feel that the program preferably should be directed toward the iron curtain countries rather than toward the people in America to obtain bigger and better appropriations? Does not the gentleman think, as was pointed out in the Saturday Evening Post editorial that is now on the stands, that the answer to this is not just the appropriation of millions and millions of dollars?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no doubt about that; but this program has also got to be beamed into the friendly foreign countries as I made clear before, who are our allies all over the world, and those free peoples who are standing with us all over the world. I care more than anything else that the program that is carried be a good program to confirm and uphold America's leadership in the world rather than a fuzzy program. And I think misunderstanding of or dissatisfaction with the expansion program presented to the committee is responsible for the lack of respect for it on the floor of the House and that there was no other reason why this appropriation was turned down.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there anything to the report that Russia has issued a decree of death to any of her people who read or listen to the Voice of America?

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that is a very well substantiated report and that it is considered one of the crimes against the state for which anyone can be haled before a people's court without any public notice or trial as we know it and be summarily sentenced to death. This certainly should confirm the need for the voice in our weapons against communism—precisely because the Russians fear it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Would not the gentleman agree that the program as carried by the Voice of America so far has been a fuzzy program?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not agree with that at all. I will say that the program carried so far has not been as good as it could be, but it has been of material usefulness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. What has been very fuzzy, if the gentleman will permit me, is the policy behind the program, not what the program has been doing in trying to tell the people of the world the great advantages of freedom. The policy has been fuzzy, particularly on the ideological front. We have assumed that all the people in the world will believe that just as soon as we mention the words freedom and democracy what we say must be true, whereas the people of the world want to see it translated in terms of more goods and services and the actual machinery of freedom leading to better lives in their own country. Then they will follow American leadership.

Mr. MASON. Would the gentleman agree that the material they have used in trying to implement the fuzzy policy has been fuzzy material?

Mr. JAVITS. Some of it has, but a good deal of it has been pretty good; but I think the uncertainty back of the policy has been the thing that caused the major weakness. In this bill the committee is repudiating at this time a fuzzy presentation of what when it is put up in the right way with full substantiation may be accepted as a fine expansion of the program.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has made a very smart statement in the sense that he has sought to create the impression that there is no dissatisfaction whatever with the way the Voice of America has carried on. I should like to say to him that while the committee probably would not like to make the admission, there is in this item of the bill an element of a want of confidence in the activities of the Voice of America.

While Mr. Byrnes was Secretary of State, and after the Voice of America had fallen into ill repute I joined with others of you in the endeavor to save it. BILL BENTON, then in charge, having rescued it from the ditch, was giving to the agency all of his fine talents, the benefit of his wide experience, and all the influence that he could bring to bear in behalf of making it what it ought to be, but all of a sudden and for some unknown reason there was a change made in the head of the State Department. Mr. Byrnes went out and General Marshall came in, and with the coming in of General Marshall, BILL BENTON, now United States Senator, who had labored earnestly in the endeavor to do a good and worth-while job, was let out and with his departure the whole thing fell back into the keeping of the people who had made an outrageous mess of it.

As I have said before, the Voice of America could be made a very important and a very valuable adjunct to the State Department, but under circumstances as now exist there is nothing that you can do for the Voice of America that will give it the standing which it should properly have here at home and in other parts of the world until something happens to the agency of which it is a small adjunct. At the present moment the State Department does not enjoy sufficient public confidence to enable it to wield the influence in this country or abroad which it should wield and until recognition of that fact has been taken and something done about it there is not much that we can do to give relief.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. All the perfumes of Arabia would not sweeten the Voice of America as now constituted, of what they call the Voice of America.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, toward the close of the last session of Congress I suggested that a special committee be appointed to study the Voice of America, this committee to be in continual session month after month while the House is in session or out of session and bring back to the House periodically what the committee thinks should be done regarding the Voice of America. We have had hours and hours of debate as to what should be done in this respect. I feel such a special committee would be very, very valuable.

At one time I thought the bill would go through. The State Department at one time stated it favored such a committee to report back what legislation is needed. Then I was told later by the State Department that the administration would not go along with the idea. I hope something of that sort can be done now and that a continuing committee will be appointed.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. Chairman, may I say at this time I believe the Members here are not hearing the voices at home or the voices from the disabled regarding the UMT program in our national defense bill. There are two groups here at the Capitol today, one the veterans of World War II and one the veterans of the Korean action. Those men say we should have universal military training.

We went into the Korean War without a particle of training or equipment for many of our boys. Universal military training will give the boys at least basic training so that if we have an emergency like Korea—and we think of what happened at Pearl Harbor—then those boys will have basic military training, and they could more readily defend themselves. It seems to me that is the least we can do for them.

The State commander of the American Legion—Commander Grader—is here from Massachusetts and is going to plead if necessary with the Members to vote for UMT. He has come at personal sacrifice for he is a very busy man. We also hear from the mothers of Massachusetts and elsewhere that they want universal military training. We hear particularly from the mothers of the disabled men of all wars who feel that their boys did not have a chance to defend themselves, their boys did not know anything, or very little, about any kind of military training.

I do not know what will be offered in the defense bill in respect to UMT, but I shall support a provision for universal military training, and I shall do everything in my power to secure its adoption. I can see nothing else to do at this time. I feel sometimes, Mr. Chairman, that we sit in this very comfortable Chamber with the doors closed and the shutters drawn. We are hearing what is going on in the Chamber here rather than evaluating the true feeling of the people all over the country. I am going to vote just as my conscience dictates, just as you are going to vote what your conscience dictates. I have seen a great many men disabled, as many as you have. There are many disabled veterans here in the Congress, and I have seen the suffering that ensued because we were not prepared. We are better prepared today to defend Western Europe and taking Western Europe if Russia strikes than we were during World War II, when Hitler was in power. We are better prepared in the Pacific than we were at the time of Pearl Harbor. It is my belief we can take them both and keep them both if we increase our strength. Today we are fighting, not to win a war, but for our very survival.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For an additional amount for "American sections, international commissions," $36,500, which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations"; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available to enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaty between the United States of American and Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and, in view of the fact that I was not able to get time in general debate, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Voice of America, I deliberately waited until this long in the debate to be sure that nearly everybody who had comments to make would make them. I find myself with this point of view. I am convinced that every man and lady in this Chamber is of the opinion that he or she could run a hotel or a railroad or a baseball club better than the people who are supposed to run them, and I now add to that list the Voice of America. I am also of the opinion that

no matter from the many and varied walks of lift that you, my distinguished colleagues, spring the night before election, that when the election returns are in we have four-hundred and thirty-odd Secretaries of State about half past 10 on Tuesday night. I also believe currently we are acquiring 430 chiefs of a general staff and secretaries of defense. My compliments to the House and to the Congress. The country is indeed safe, being assured of all those things. Now I find out that down in the bowels of this Capitol from which my subcommittee comes up for air once a day during the months of these hearings we are experts on how you bounce the waves from the ionosphere and how you loop ground waves that only electronic specialists and the great technicians of communications know. Today the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and from Nebraska and Georgia and Minnesota and Ohio, they know; indeed we do. Misable dictu!

Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that neither this subcommittee in its entirity nor any individual member of this subcommittee has ever been in the building of the Voice of America? Do you know that we never have heard a broadcast in the last two and a quarter years or seen any of their productions, we experts, we engineering and scientific technicians? Not a man on the subcommittee has had anything to do with the Voice of America for the last two and a quarter years.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I should like to correct the gentleman. I have heard broadcasts of the Voice of America.

Mr. FLOOD. Then certainly the gentleman is a rara avis in this great, distinguished body. I do not know of anybody else that has.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], with whom I have been battling about this since the Seventy-eighth Congress. Indeed I do.

Mr. TABER. I have always made it my business to ask for the broadcasts and go over them. I have found many of them that were no good, and none of them that were any good. I dare the manager to produce one that was good. That has been going on a long time.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I think I have the only voice here that can probably match his.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I cannot yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I did not intend to, my dear, but to you, of course.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It is always a rare pleasure to hear the gentleman. It is also a rare pleasure to see him, because he is always a picture of sartorial perfection.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentlewoman permit me at this point to interject for the purpose of emphasis, only because I knew she would be here.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate that.

May I add my word, that I not only have heard the Voice of America but I have even spoken on the Voice of America. I do not think it was a very good broadcast, and I am very sure it was highly inappropriate, because I was asked to speak on an "equal rights" amendment for women, and when I got to the station to make it I was informed that they did not think it was a wise selection because it might make people behind the iron curtain feel that the women in America did not have equal rights. I said I thought that had been known for a long time, but apparently it was only discovered at the last minute. For that reason, I had to change my broadcast, and I am afraid it was rather unsuccessful.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say to the gentlewoman that, having been a bridegroom of only a year, my version of "equal rights" has been improved from that time.

I wanted to say that this is a supplemental bill. It deals not with the whole broad program of the Voice of America, but this is a supplemental bill to establish the physical facilities for its entire program. I am not concerned today, and you should not be, with the philosophy of the script or the intent and policy of this program. I would not be presumptuous and impertinent enough to say that this distinguished array of talent were not addressing themselves to the subject, but let me point out to you again that this is a request for appropriations to build the physical structure that you all have to use, you general managers of the Voice of America, no matter who you decide, including yourselves, are to operate it.

This subcommittee directed the Voice of America to go get the best scientific brains in this Nation, and to bring in a report. The Voice of America did exactly what you told them to do. In this testimony you will find the biography of and a report on the best electronics and communications engineers in the greatest Nation on communications and electronics in the world.

I do say, Mr. Chairman, that the administrative technique, and particularly the engineering accomplishments of the Voice of America, have been extraordinary and could not be equalled or excelled in the entire commercial field of radio, electronics, and communications. This is the report of a committee you directed to bring in an investigation of how these people were doing that job. That is before you.

My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] by innuendo cast an aspersion upon the report of the Advisory Committee of the Eightieth Congress. You have heard about that. The Eightieth Congress gave birth to the committee. On this committee you find—and I am sure these are not long-haired, flat-headed do-gooders—Edwin Callahan, editor of the Christion Science Monitor; Philip Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.; Mark A. May, of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale; Justin Miller, president of the National Association of Broadcasters; and Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post. They are the people who made this report. Mr. Hibbs did not sign it, because at the time his name was not confirmed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this report which I hold in my hand and which the press carried all over the Nation yesterday was written, mark you, before this obnoxious document masquerading itself under the guise of a report from the Committee on Appropriations, which it is not—as I say, this repoort was written before the subcommittee report was prepared, and by as distinguished an array of talent as this Congress could collect to do the job. They have been close to the Voice of America for two and a half years. I am not going to bore you with the report at length, but I am going to insert it in the RECORD, so that you can read it as part of this debate. At the same time, it has been directed by you to be reported to the Congress anyhow, and it will be available to you.

Let me show you this. I quote from page 6 thereof:

> A prominent business and professional man, an expert in administrative organization, in response to our inquiry recently told our commission that in his view the administrative work in this area is of high caliber and would do credit to the best organized private business.
>
> Another professional expert, commenting to us on the operations of the International Broadcasting Division, has said that there are few radio administrators or engineers in the country who have capacities to excel those in charge of this operation. No doubt these two private experts, as well as many others, would be glad to testify to the business efficiency and leadership of such men as now are carrying on this far-flung program.

Let me point out to you that contrary to the impression that has been given to you today, and incidentally, I presided at the hearing of this subcommittee when the experts from MIT, whose names you will find in this testimony—and you cannot get a greater collection of communications and electronics men in the world—stated to me time and again that this is the best and this is the most effective and cheapest way in which this job can be done at this time by anybody any place in the world. I am holding no brief today for some person or some group of persons who may be running or who may not be running, depending upon your point of view, this program.

I care not what you do or where you place this program. You may create it as an independent agency at Cabinet level; you may set it up in the ECA, although God forbid that you do that. You may do what you wish, but I say to

you, Mr. Chairman, that no matter what you do with the program as an operating agency, in God's name grant in this Congress the necessary appropriations to build the physical structure. I do not care what you do at this time with the programing. I will debate that with you when the general appropriation bill for the State Department, including the Information Service and that part of it which is the Voice of America, is before this House, in due course. It is not here today. All of this talk you have heard has nothing to do with the case, tra, la, la. Nothing. This goes for capital investment; not operating funds. You have got to have these stations, you have got to have the towers, you have to have the facilities. These people must be able to contract for them now. You know the pressure, the need, and the demand for these kinds of electronic, physical, and radio equipment in great shortage and great demand.

Objection has been made, Mr. Chairman, that we do not know where they are. They have not pin-pointed them down in some duplex apartment or in the south 40 acres where this is going to be. Some lawyer has not brought to this subcommittee a certificate of title.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has again expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to presume, but since I am doing a solo on this, apparently——

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very grateful to my brothers who this late in the afternoon will entertain so graciously this extension of time.

Now, you members serve on legislative committees. That is something for you to keep in mind. Oh, there is more to this than meets the eye in this debate. I am satisfied that statements have been made on the floor this afternoon, with great sincerity, and with the regard and affection that I hold for some of the Members who have made them, nevertheless I am convinced as I am convinced that there is a God in heaven, that those voices, Mr. Chairman, never were, and, praise God, never will be the Voice of America now or at any other time. But let me say this. You do not see these hearings. Some of my good friends on the left, sincerely inquired about "Where is the record? The testimony does not show the justification. What have you got? We are interested. How do you prove this need for $97,000,000?" That is a fair question. I say to you that you have not been fairly told what happened. I will tell you. These experts from the Voice of America who, in consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff—you know the practice here today of wrapping themselves in the sanctity of the Chiefs of Staff, and upon occasion I do that, reluctantly; but I will do it for this purpose. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been consulted step by step on every phase of this program, and have endorsed it in toto. Did you know that? When I ask you to vote funds to set up the physical structure of this great undertaking, do you not know that that physical structure will be available, if and when necessary, to the Armed Forces for whatever intent and purpose they may find necessary, but God forbid, which they may need in combat? Do you not know that the Bureau of Standards and every other phase of the technical side of this Government has been consulted step by step, hour by hour, on every period and comma and the crossing of a "t" in this great program?

I do not know anything, as far as the itemized justification is concerned, being incomplete. This is a mass production of this physical equipment. Every single component part is interchangeable with any other part if and when necessary in the entire great ring around the periphery of Soviet Russia. And you were not told, Mr. Chairman, that these are for short-wave with also—medium wave broadcasting stations and each station can be used as a point of origination for a program. Ah, you were not told that. I am not going to take your time today to debate the merits of scripts, how certain programs were written, who channeled others. I hold no brief for things that are bad, but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is about time, and the time is now, that on the floor of this House and in this Nation's Capital we point out to the people of America that the good in this House and the good in this Government and the good in this city and the good in this Nation ten thousand times ten thousand exceeds and excels the evil, the bad. Do you not know that? Of course you do. It was not by accident that our forefathers decided the motto of this Nation to be "In God We Trust." In God we do trust, because the evil things make better reading.

I am certain that no Member of this body, no Member of this Congress, or any loyal American, would willingly do a disservice to his country.

All patriotic Americans, at this time, are searching and yearning to find ways in which they can serve the national welfare. They realize that the democratic world, with all its values which invest life with dignity and purpose, is under constant, vicious and unremitting attacks from Soviet-led Communists.

The American people, inside and outside of Congress, have been made grimly aware that the masters of the Kremlin are not indulging in academic discussion when they assert that democracy cannot exist in the same world with imperialistic communism. Americans daily are closing their ranks in recognition of the threat of the enemy and his avowed purpose to destroy the free world.

Daily our people are becoming more informed on the true nature of Soviet imperialism and how it menaces our security, our free way of life.

We have witnessed the Soviets reneging on their pledged word, given solemnly time and again before the world; we have witnessed their naked aggression as they have devoured lesser, neighboring states; we have seen them, under one pretense and another, build the nucleus of a major military organization in East Germany, and we have watched, and are witnessing with increasing anxiety, their filling in of those military cadres in that area.

The world has not forgotten, nor will it for many decades, the Soviets' efforts to use mass starvation and deprivation as an instrument of national policy in their misguided and thwarted attempt to establish the Berlin blockade. In that instance, the might of American airpower, in concert with our European Allies, foiled a diabolical plot against a whole people. It behooves us to be equally effective against the subtler forms of Soviet attack.

Latterly, we are seeing the Politburo pressing buttons as the Soviets endeavor to increase tensions in Europe, and this at a time when Gromyko is indulging in thin artifices in the name of peace in Paris.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, all of America is only too aware of the Soviet treachery which finds bloody expression in Korea, and is now, through the greatly expanded use of air power, and the use of Manchurian bases, enabling Sovietized China to prepare what may be heavy blows upon American soldiery and their United Nations' brothers in arms.

So by deed and word we know the enemy and what we are up against. At least we should, but sometimes, as I watch and study our daily actions, I wonder if all of us fully apprehend Soviet subtleties.

One thing I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the Soviets use propaganda as a major instrument of policy, both internally and externally. This is abundantly evident and is well documented by Gen. Bedell Smith, who, in his diplomatic tour of duty in Moscow, had ample opportunity to see this weapon in use first-hand.

The world is in a turmoil today, Mr. Speaker, because of the big lie and the implementation of the nonethical national conduct it represents.

Day and night Soviet propagandists are busy with their upside-down language as they defame western nations and everything that western culture stands for. No reach of the globe is too far distant for the Soviet propagandists to be unconcerned about; their industry and energy are unsurpassed by their total disregard for the truth.

As a measure of their activity, I would point out that the Soviets in their propaganda activities outdo us in the ratio of 5 to 1. Need I elaborate for you what this means as the Soviet dictators pursue their drive toward world mastery?

What is an arresting and disturbing thought is that while Stalin and his cohorts have mounted the most formidable peacetime military machine in history, at the same time, they are operating a vast program of misinformation, calumnies, and lies and that one is used to aid and abet the other.

The Soviets literally are conducting a war of penetration over a wide area. Through the devices of propaganda, and with the menacing overtones of their

military strength, they are now, at this very moment, feverishly active in trying to bring about the capitulation of not a few states. An example of this dual offensive is Iran, where Russian propaganda grinds on threateningly within the shadow of Russian arms.

And so we cannot say, Mr. Chairman, that we are unaware of diabolical Soviet efforts of expansionism. Neither can we say that we are uninformed as to their effectiveness. Then we must inevitably face up the proposition: What, I ask, are we going to do about it?

Now, I say in all sincerity that I regret the occasion has ever arisen in this forum where it would be found necessary for any Member to be compelled to speak as I do upon such a subject and at this fateful juncture in history.

You know and I know, Mr. Chairman, that thinking Americans are aghast at the action of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which, in one fell swoop, knocked out some $90,000,000 which were earmarked for the purchase of transmitters to carry the propaganda fight to the Soviets.

The man in the street, who knows instinctively that America has a story to tell and that it should be spread before the world, is confused and confounded at the action of the Appropriations Subcommittee in voting to deny funds that are so sorely needed to strengthen the Voice of America.

This congressional action, which would serve the purpose of making truth the first casualty in the cold war, is equally perplexing to all who have followed the history of this activity. President Truman in his pertinent statement last week on the subcommittee's restrictive action, wisely pointed out that the vote in effect was a reversal of the same group's prior action last year when it voted to implement an expansion plan for the Voice of America.

In the welter of discussion, and despite the pious pretensions of the Members who wielded the ax, let it not be overlooked that the program this money was to finance was considered upon the very highest levels of government; that it was studied and approved, I repeat, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; that it was authorized by the National Security Council.

Additionally, may I attest that in the conception, development, and refinement of this plan the Government had the benefit of the best technical skills available in the form of consultants from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Just how the members of the subcommittee who voted against funds for the extension of this vital informational project rationalized their objections poses a curious mental problem for me.

What I am seriously afraid of is that the inspired leaders of the opposition, drawing their opposition from sources best known to themselves, have made a serious error of misidentification. It is well known that the subcommittee which rejected the request for these much-needed funds has a quarrel with the management of the Office of International Information and Education Exchange, State Department, which supervises the popular Voice of America. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the opponents of this well-recommended appropriation are going wide of the mark in their zeal to enforce punitive action against this Government agency. The subcommittee members have their targets confused. And, mind you, I am not, even for the sake of argument, lending any credence to the complaint for there is much impressive evidence to the contrary. As a matter of fact, the United States Advisory Commission on Information, comprising distinguished experts of long experience in the informational field, have gone on record strongly testifying to the able and efficient management of the whole program.

But to return to my point: I say again and again the funds here under consideration are for physical facilities for use several years hence. No matter who will be in charge, certainly the Voice of America will be in operation, unless disaster overwhelms the democratic world; of course, it will not be very vocal if it continues to receive the kind of congressional treatment it has received from the Appropriations Committee.

Allowing just for discussion's sake for the moment the validity of the subcommittee's charge of inefficiency in management, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you will agree the prescription for relief of the condition is drastically dangerous. You do not cut off the patient's head to cure a toothache.

And while we are on the subject of the subcommittee's criticism of the management, I find it surpassingly strange that not a single member of the dissident group has ever once visited the headquarters of the Voice of America to inspect their facilities, to see the plant in operation in the last 2¼ years. Now this might be understandable if their headquarters were located remotely in Alaska, but after all the Voice's functional operations are in centrally located New York, readily accessible from many points. Of course, it may all have been done with mirrors; the subcommittee may have a monopoly on crystal balls, but certainly the conclusions were not based on first-hand inspectional information.

If I may be allowed a mild discursion for a moment, I would like to point out that on this same subject of efficient operation and effectiveness, the Voice of America each month receives thousands of letters from listeners inside iron-curtain territory attesting to their appreciation of its great value. I could give you exact totals and points of origin of such testimonials, but you know that I am precluded from doing this because of security reasons. It is sufficient to say, however, that all such affirmative evidence was available to the subcommittee, but the critics were so filled with their intent of denunciation that no time or thought apparently could be spared upon such a legitimate and pertinent study.

I must apologize for yielding to the attractive temptation of discussing the merits of the management of the Voice of America. I know that this group is whole-hearted and whole-souled in its work; there is a fighting team on the field for the Voice; the members have enthusiasm, energy, experience, and ability. They are a dedicated crew if I ever saw one. But I need must discipline myself and return to the heart of this problem—the funds in question, the facilities herein proposed are an entirely separate matter and should be so considered. They relate to a future day, a larger operation, a stronger Voice. If that imperative objective is to be realized, then the start must be made now. Time remains one of the great allies and assets of the democracies—we squander it only at our own peril.

Certainly, we would not cancel out our military training program because of our inability, at this hour, to agree upon a commander who might head a campaign 2 or 3 years hence. That, of course, would be a tragically foolish thing to do, as I know you will agree, and yet this analogy is perfectly fitted to the negating action of the appropriations subcommittee in slashing this fund as it has done.

Perhaps we may find some measure of guidance and inspiration in what Father Brown, the fictional masterpiece of Gilbert K. Chesterton, calls the essential clue. It may be providential that in cutting the heart out of this appropriation the subcommittee left some identifying entrails; believe it or not, the sum authorized by the subcommittee after its financial Roman holiday is for the implementation of one phase of this expansion of facilities program.

I must remind you that in a happier day of clearer vision, when thinking was more attuned to the realities of the international situation, and was not beclouded with personal feelings or actuated by revenge politics, and the national welfare everywhere was put above a personal vendetta, this same subcommittee set in motion this very program which it now so wantonly strikes down. Thus has it repudiated its own child in a sorry and shabby way.

Mr. Chairman, if I may indulge just for a brief bit further on your consideration, I would like to quote the opinion of that great and distinguished American, General Eisenhower, on the need for the things these slashed funds would procide. In addressing the Members of this Congress back in February, General Eisenhower said:

> I believe that the United States needs a very,very much stronger information service. In our case, I would not call it propaganda because the truth is all we need.
>
> We do not have to falsify the record nor our own intentions.

Now Mr. Chairman, I am sure you must be struck forcibly by the contradiction that we would propose to set up air bases on the Soviet periphery yet refuse to build a ring of transmitters so that the democratic story of freemen can be carried to the captives behind the iron curtain with force and clarity.

Are we to forego rich opportunities to expand the talking war in the hope that a total shooting war may be avoided?

Who wants to take the responsibility for this misguided restrictive measure upon his conscience?

To fail to make an all-out effort on the truth-propaganda front is, I submit, to commit political hara-kiri.

By our own hand we would be inflicting a self-invited defeat of major proportions in the cold war.

Mr. Chairman, I pray with all the humility and sincerity at my command that wiser counsel will ultimately prevail that the RECORD will never attest that this body was guilty of the grave political sin of strangling the Voice of Freedom.

I was very interested in hearing what the Congressman from New York had to say this afternoon with regard to the three dispatches which he claims are critical of the State Department's information program. I might mention that since these are classified documents—two confidential and one restricted—this is really news.

Since the Congressman from New York has taken the trouble to point out certain of the items contained in the dispatches, I think we ought to be thorough in the matter and point out some other things which he did not mention.

In the first place, the Congressman from New York failed to point out that only 10 copies of the pamphlets were distributed as pilot models, in order to obtain the reactions of the various country missions as to their usefulness in each country. I think we should consider it as evidence of good management on the part of the information program that they send these pamphlets out to the Embassies to find out whether it will serve a useful purpose for them to be translated and printed for distribution in the country and in what manner they need be adapted in order to obtain the maximum effectiveness.

It is quite true that in the Scandinavian country concerned, our Embassy reported that the pamphlets, A People Moves Ahead and A Community in Action, would not be useful. It is interesting that the Department, in its prior planning, did not contemplate a language version for Scandinavia. The Congressman from New York failed to point out that the third of the three pamphlets sent to this Embassy received a very warm welcome and that the Embassy said in the quoted dispatch that it could use 40,000 copies of Meet Some Americans in Norwegian and 5,000 copies of the English edition.

At the risk of boredom, I would like to point out again that these pamphlets were sent out to the Embassies in very small numbers—I believe it is only 10 for each Embassy—for critical comment. We, and particularly the Congressman from New York, should be glad that the USIE program is so well run that it obtains such critical comment before it spends the taxpayers' money in having the pamphlets printed in large numbers of translated versions.

And now we come to the comments which were made regarding the VOA audience in Cuba. As was pointed out, the dispatch mentioned a survey in which it was estimated that only 697 persons listened to a VOA program at a particular period of time. The Congressman failed to point out that the same survey stated that since there are 80 licensed stations in Cuba and a free press and radio and since Cuba is near to America—that country is considerably less than ideal for shortwave programs. If we are going to compete in Cuba, and in other Latin-American countries, with other radio programs we shall have to do it on the basis of medium wave. How the Department of State is going to turn the Voice of America into a competitive medium-wave program even though it is denied the funds to establish the necessary radio facilities is a question which perhaps my distinguished colleague can answer.

That the information program operators recognize this problem and are trying to meet it within their fund limitations is clearly brought out in a part of the dispatch which was not mentioned previously. This part shows that a daily USIE commentary program, prepared and paid for by the information people in the embassy, has quite a high rating for this type of show. This show was estimated as being listened to by approximately 10 percent of the sets turned on during the period studied.

Furthermore, it has not been previously pointed out that the dispatch says that the survey was entirely based on Havana listeners and did not include local stations in Cuba on which broad use of VAO recordings is made.

Lastly, it was not pointed out that according to the dispatch the embassy itself was not trying to prove or disprove anything but merely sending in a piece of information to be used, along with many, many other pieces, in evaluating the program.

If we are to have an information program with maximum effectiveness, it is necessary that that program look at itself and have others look at it, as objectively and as critically as possible. I know of no better way to kill this spirit of objective criticism on the part of those operating the program, than to make broad and denunciatory comments each time the program receives one of these critical appraisals.

[From the New York Times of April 8, 1951]

MORE "VOICE" FUNDS HELD A VITAL NEED—COMMISSION IN REPORT WRITTEN BEFORE PROPOSED CUT OF 90 PERCENT CITES DANGEROUS SITUATION

WASHINGTON, April 7.—A group of four private citizens constituting the United States Advisory Commission on Information, finding the situation at this moment more dangerous than 6 months ago, appealed to Congress today to supply whatever funds were necessary for an all-out war of ideas.

The commission, submitting its semiannual report, in effect took sharp issue with the drastic cut of 90 percent administered by the House Appropriations Committee yesterday to the State Department's request for Voice of America funds.

Writing before the commitee's action was taken, the authors of the commission report urged Congress to meet the administration's request for the supplemental $97,500,000 sought for expanding the facilities for "The Campaign of Truth." The House Funds Committee voted to give only $9,533,939.

REPORT BACKS MARSHALL

Agreeing with General of the Army George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, that the world situation had worsened in the last 6 months, the commission declared:

"Therefore we strongly urge that Congress keep right on providing enough ammunition and manpower with which to wage the war of ideas. To cut down the information program at this critical moment would be to court new disasters.

"Although the tide of Communist influence in Western Europe has been turned back, it is manifest that in vast uncommitted areas of the world the United States has a long way to go in clarifying its motives and its meaning to peoples. Such clarification requires a major information program. We must not stop or slow up now."

Set up by Congress in 1948 to recommend information policies and programs for the Secretary of State, the commission found in its report that the State Department had done a laudable job with the Voice of America and needed additional funds to improve and expand its effectiveness.

EARLY CONGRESS ACTION HAILED

The report also had some kind words for the Eighty-first Congress, praising the legislators for providing last year the funds to lay the groundwork for an adequate effort.

"It is immensely gratifying," the report went on, "that the real nature of the world crisis was perceived by Congress, and that enough funds to mobilize our ideological warfare were made available.

"This commission has always emphasized that it is far more important to spend well than it is to spend a lot. But there is real danger now, in April 1951, that we slip back into complacency."

Of special interest to the State Department was the commission's recommendation that the international information program remain in the State Department. It has been proposed by Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, that the Voice of America and other such information efforts be administered by a new agency.

The commission reported that its major recommendations over the last 2½ years had been largely carried out by the State Department. These recommendations asked that the information program be closely integrated with policy-making at all levels; that the programs be substantially enlarged; that additional skilled people be brought into the effort, and that the program itself be carefully evaluated in the field.

On the basis of its last half-year of study, the commission listed these conclusions:

"That the program is being efficiently administered.

"That its personnel has been greatly improved, and is being steadily enriched by specialists of larger experience and talent.

"That the expansion authorized by the Eighty-first Congress as the 'Campaign of Truth' is being effectively carried forward.

"That most of the recommendations made by this commission have been put into effect.

"That a great deal more can be done, and must be done, before the United States will be adequately waging the war of ideas.

"That the evaluation techniques through which the Department tests its programs need further strengthening, as much as possible through independent sources."

SEPARATE AGENCY NOT FAVORED

"That grave doubts exist whether major structural changes, such as taking the program outside the State Department, will be an improvement. We are aware of the advantages of a separate agency, but we are more impressed by the disadvantages of divorcing policymaking from operation, and of setting up almost inevitably conflicting representation in foreign countries.

"That channels which have been opened up to bring American private expertness into the program in advisory and consultative capacities show great promise of effective results."

The Chairman of the Commission is Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science

Monitor. Other members are Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.; Mark A. May, director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale, and Justin Miller, president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post, did not sign the report because he was only recently named to the commission and has not yet been confirmed by the Senate.

PROPOSAL FOR LATIN AMERICA

WASHINGTON, April 7.—The information program is running head-on into competition with Russia in Latin America, the commission said in an analysis of the State Department's information program in Mexico and Brazil submitted with its general report.

Written by Justin Miller, who attended the meeting of the Inter-American Association of Broadcasters in Sao Paulo, it said the distribution of books and magazines was important in combating communism in both countries.

"In the several cities which I visited I found liberal quantities of Russian magazines," Mr. Miller wrote. "I inquired what sale there is for such magazines and upon what basis they are handled by the news vendors, but was not able to get a satisfactory answer.

"There is a good deal of speculation to the effect that Russia is supplying these magazines free of charge to the news vendors and that they are taking whatever profit they can get out of those which they sell."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 8, 1951]

STATE DEPARTMENT CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH IS RUN WELL, OUTSIDE EXPERTS SAY—CONGRESS' ADVISORY GROUP WARNS OF BIG JOB AHEAD IN WAR OF IDEAS, URGES NECESSARY FUNDS

(By James E. Warner)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—The State Department's information program, the Campaign of Truth aimed at both sides of the iron curtain, is being efficiently administered, a commission of private experts reported tonight.

The opinion was given by the United States Advisory Commission on Information, headed by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor.

The Commission warned, however, that much more must be done to spread the Campaign of Truth around the world before the United States will be adequately waging the war of ideas, and called on Congress to continue to provide funds.

The warning came as the House pondered a recommendation from its Appropriations Committee to ignore a special plea from President Truman earlier this week and reduce from $97,500,000 to $9,533,939 the budget for the Voice of America, which is the broadcasting section of the over-all information program.

The Commission was making its fourth semiannual report to Congress. It agreed with Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall that the world situation is more dangerous now than 6 months ago and urged Congress "to keep right on providing enough ammunition and manpower with which to wage the war of ideas."

Conceding that the State Department currently is a political target area, the Commission nevertheless opposed proposals to take the information program away from that Department and establish it either as an independent entity, or put it in another agency, possibly the Economic Cooperation Administration.

It indorsed congressional proposals for an investigation of the program, however, provided that the inquiry would not monopolize the time of those trying to operate the program.

Signers of the report, in addition to Mr. Canham, are Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.; Mark A. May, director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University, and Justin Miller, president of the National Association of Broadcasters. Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post, nominated recently as the fifth member of the Commission, did not sign it because he has not yet been confirmed by the Senate and felt that he is not sufficiently informed about operations of the program.

CONCLUSIONS LISTED

The Commission said its present basic conclusions are:

"That the program is being efficiently administered; that its personnel has been greatly improved, and is being steadily enriched by specialists of larger experience and talent; that the expansion authorized by the Eighty-first Congress as the Campaign of Truth is being effectively carried forward; that most of the recommendations made by the commission have been put into effect."

It added, however, that: "A great deal more can be done, and must be done, before the United States will be adequately waging the war of ideas; that the evaluation techniques through which the Department tests its program needs further strengthening, as much as possible through independent sources."

"Grave doubts exist," the Commission said, "whether major structural changes, such as taking the program outside the State Department, will be an improvement. We are aware of the advantage of separate agency, but we are more impressed by the disadvantages of divorcing policy-making from operation, and of setting up almost inevitably conflicting representation in foreign countries."

NEED OF SINGLE VOICE NOTED

Developing the latter point, the Commission said that a vital requisite is that the information program should not be remote from policy-planning.

"Another equally significant need," it said, "is that the United States abroad should speak with a single voice. There can be separate tones and modulations in that voice, and a choice of vocabularies, but the voice should not contradict itself. We do not believe that the Office of War Information operations in World War II were altogether happy as far as policy coordination is concerned."

Transfer of the program to a separate agency or to the ECA "would inevitably tend to set up rival United States embassies in foreign countries," the Commission declared.

"One would be the regular State Department embassy. The other would be the ECA or the information set-up. Strenuous efforts would be needed, and in the past they have not always been successful, to bridge the gulf between two such entities * * * thus the chasm between the information and policy—which this commission has tried so earnestly to help close—would begin to yawn again. At times there would seem to be two policies: The official State Department one, and the one being promulgated by the information people. This would be a deplorable state of affairs. No propaganda can be any stronger than the policy from which it springs * * * since most foreign policy is made by the State Department, the closer the information program can be to the State Department the more effective the propaganda will be."

REPORTS ON LATIN AMERICA

Within the State Department the commission said it would "be very interested" in raising information activities to the level of the Under Secretary of State, noting that by the end of this year nearly half the department's employees and half of its funds will be devoted to information work. At present the program is directed by an Assistant Secretary, Edward W. Barrett.

Mr. Miller reported independently on operations in Latin America, and particularly of the program in Mexico and Brazil, where he recently visited. Like the commission as a whole, Mr. Miller found the program generally good, but noted that he found "some apparent road blocks resulting from unwillingness of some foreign service officers to accept the information service."

Specifically, Mr. Miller reported that such road blocks has resulted in the failure to put mobile units into operation in Brazil, and in delays for information officers sometimes stretching into weeks because of an insistence that their communications go "through channels."

The full commission noted that in the past it had told the State Department about certain individuals in the program being "unsuited to their jobs" and that the department had taken "informed action." It mentioned no names, but said it is prepared to give Congress its "candid judgment" on anyone in the program if asked.

"We now understand," the members said, "that some of the men at the top of this program are under severe criticism in some congressional circles. We stand ready to give our evaluation of these individuals if it is desired. But we wish to state unequivocably that since the application of the Hoover Commission reorganization, this program has steadily improved in its administration. We regard the keymen in the program as skilled and experienced administrators."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of April 8, 1951]

RAYBURN TO DEMAND REASON FOR DRASTIC CUT IN "VOICE" FUND—WANTS PROOF OF NEED TO REDUCE PROGRAM AGAINST COMMUNISM

Speaker RAYBURN said yesterday he would question on the House floor an $88,000,000 slash in a State Department request for $97,500,000 for the Voice of America.

Mr. RAYBURN, who has demonstrated his awareness of the far-reaching and devious menace of communism, showed in an interview with the Star that he was disturbed by the drastic cut in funds asked for the construction of new radio transmitters for the voice program.

The slash was voted Friday by the House Appropriations Committee in reporting a third supplemental appropriation bill. The committee voted for $9,533,939 to complete seven radio construction projects now under way and turned down a State Department request for funds for the building of 13 additional facilities to carry the message of democracy behind the iron curtain.

DEMONSTRATION IS WANTED

In saying he would ask some questions about the cut in the voice funds, Mr. RAYBURN said:

"I want them (the committee members) to demonstrate that the amount the committee recommends is sufficient to carry on the Voice of America program in an efficient manner."

In its action, the House committee overrode a special plea by President Truman who said earlier that the additional money would enable the Voice of America to expand its broadcasts to countries behind the iron curtain.

There was no specific comment from the State Department on the committee's action. But officials said it was impossible to supply the committee with details it asked about the proposed new construction of

transmission facilities until it had funds with which to carry on the undertaking.

NEGOTIATIONS ARE BLOCKED

Manufacturers, it was pointed out, will not take the trouble to make detailed estimates for new transmitters when there is no certainty of money being available to order them.

Similarly, they added, they cannot negotiate successfully for land abroad on which to build the transmitters until there is money available to buy the land.

On the question of the effect on the efficiency of the Voice program—the question that Mr. RAYBURN will raise—State Department spokesmen pointed out that it was necessary "to get our story behind the iron curtain."

The additional transmitters for which funds were requested and denied by the Appropriations Committee, it was added, are needed to bring the message of democracy to the countries cut off from other means of information. Most of them would be medium-wave transmitters to reach a larger audience than present short-wave broadcasts.

WOULD BE VITAL BLOW

Hence this State Department attitude: The House committee action, if not overruled by the House itself, will strike vitally at the efficiency and primary purpose of the Voice program.

In denying the State Department request the committee, in a formal report, said that "lack of proper planning, poor management, and avoidable delays in the execution of plans and contracts" had been shown by the State Department in furthering the Voice program.

"The material submitted to the committee in support of the estimate," the report said, "lacked definiteness and was so devoid of specific data that it could not be considered a plan of action."

POOR PLANNING CHARGED

The committee asserted it had supported the Voice program since its beginning and believed there is "a great need for combating the insidious propaganda emanating from the Kremlin." But it added:

"It wholeheartedly believes that, properly managed and directed, the Voice of America is the best medium for accomplishment of a campaign of truth that has been devised. However, the committee must say that it is very much disappointed in the accomplishments and progress to date.

"Mismanagement and poor planning with regard to both engineering and to the administrative phases of the program have cost valuable time as well as dollars."

The State Department is considering putting some of its transmission facilities on ships, the report disclosed. It said only that "a number of these planned facilities" might be located on ships. But the committee added it was given "only vague and incomplete estimates of the number and costs of such facilities as compared with land installations."

REPORT PRAISES WORK BUT SAYS MUCH MORE MUST BE ACCOMPLISHED

(By Garnett D. Horner)

American's expanded "Campaign of Truth" is being carried forward effectively but much more "must be done before the United States will be adequately waging the war of ideas," the United States Advisory Commission on Information reported last night.

Urging substantial enlargement of the foreign information program conducted by the State Department, the Commission said that to cut it down "at this critical moment would be to court new disasters."

The semi-annual Commission report to Congress came as the administration was battling a move in the House to cut Voice of America expansion funds by 90 percent.

REPORT PRAISES PROGRAM

The Commission was set up by Congress in 1948 to make recommendations to the State Department for improving the information program and report to Congress on its effectiveness. It is composed of private citizens prominent in newspapers, radio, business, and educational fields.

In its report made public last night, the Commission said its basic conclusions are that:

1. "The program is being effectively administered."

2. Its personnel "has been greatly improved."

3. Expansion authorized by the last Congress as the "Campaign of Truth is being effectively carried forward."

4. Most of the recommendations made by the Commission have been put into effect.

5. "A great deal more can be done and must be done before the United States will be effectively waging the war of ideas."

6. Evaluation techniques through which the State Department tests its programs "need further strengthening, as much as possible through independent sources."

"GREAT PROMISE" SHOWN

7. "Grave doubts exist" about whether putting the information programs under a new separate agency instead of the State Department would be an improvement. These doubts were based largely on disadvantages of divorcing information operations from policy-making.

8. Channels which have been opened up to bring American private expertness into the program in advisory and consultative capacities "show great promise of effective results."

Recalling that it previously had urged substantial enlargement of the information program, the Commission said this still is "necessary so that the United States shall not lose the struggle for men's minds and for their active support.

It warned that "there is real danger now that we slip back into complacency."

SUPPORTS MARSHALL VIEWS

Declaring that it believed Defense Secretary Marshall was right when he said recently that he regards the present situation as more dangerous than it was 6 months ago, the Commission added:

"Therefore we strongly urge that Congress keep right on providing enough ammunition and manpower with which to wage the war of ideas. To cut down the information program at this critical moment would be to court new disasters.

"Although the tide of Communist influence in Western Europe has been turned back, it is manifest that in vast uncommitted areas of the world, the United States has a long way to go in clarifying its motives and its meaning to peoples. Such clarification requires a major information program. We must not stop or slow up now."

The report was signed by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor and chairman of the Commission; Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of General Electric Co.; Mark A. May, director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University and Justin Miller, president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post and the newest member of the Commission, did not sign the report because he was not confirmed by the Senate as a member when it was prepared.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1951]

FUNDS FOR THE VOICE

Congress simply cannot afford to ignore the report on American propoganda activities issued over the week end by the small but distinguished group of private citizens who constitute the United States Advisory Commission on Information. The report is of special interest at this time, as the House may vote today on granting the funds necessary to bring the transmission facilities of the Voice of America, one of the most important factors in the information program, up to the most effective strength.

Headed by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, the Advisory Commission finds that the entire program is being efficiently administered, its personnel has been steadily improved and its expansion under previous congressional authorizations is being effectively carried forward. The commission warns Congress and the American people that there is real danger * * * that we slip back into complacency and that we must not stop or slow up now.

This is just exactly what the House would be doing if it would sustain the adverse recommendation of its Appropriations Committee in respect to the Voice. The $89,000,000 at stake would carry to rapid completion a carefully planned project (originally designed to be spread out over a 3-year period) to rim Soviet Russia and its peripherial states with transmitters that for the first time would enable the Voice effectively to get through hostile jamming and to spread its campaign of truth widely through the Soviet area. One-third of this expansion program was approved last year and is already well under way; it makes no sense deliberately to allow the work to lapse in this most critical period.

The Voice of America is a favorite whipping boy inside Congress and out, and some of the whipping may have been deserved in the past. But it seems to us that the House subcommittee, which denounced it for mismanagement and poor planning largely because all the sites of the proposed new facilities have not yet been finally selected, could not have looked very carefully or dispassionately into the problem. It is rather difficult to conclude delicate and complex negotiations with foreign countries—where many of these transmitters will be located—without knowing exactly what funds are at hand to carry out the projects.

As the Advisory Commission notes a great deal more can be done and must be done with the information program as a whole; but to cut it down now would be only to court new disasters. We have said before that we do not believe the cold war is going to be won exclusively by virtue of American propaganda abroad. Nonetheless it is a weapon of very great importance and should be used with all the boldness, determination, and resources that we have at our command. It is a major arm of American policy, and it deserves the most fair-minded and nonpolitical attention of the Congress.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 8, 1951]

HOW NOT TO DO IT

It is very easy to sympathize with the alarm of the House Appropriations Committee at rising costs of government and with its annoyance over the failure of Government agencies to cut superfluities in meeting the national emergency. But in its intemperate zeal the committee has behaved like an enthusiastic private on his first KP—the floor is littered with peels, but there is very little left of the potato.

The most shocking example of this hacking technique was the fate of the appropriation for the American information program, including the Voice of America. With a pious expression to the effect that, "properly managed and directed, the Voice of America is the best medium for accomplishment of a campaign of truth that has yet been conceived," the committee chopped off 90 percent of the sum requested. In justification,

the group charged that "avoidable delays" in placing contracts, poor planning and management had added to the cost of constructing new facilities; the committee is "very much disappointed" in the way the program of truth is being advanced, both as to methods and progress. Therefore—although this seems like a non sequitur—it is reducing the amount it recommends for the Voice to virtually nothing.

As to the effectiveness of the information project and the skill with which it is being directed, there is better testimony than the committee presents. The United States Advisory Commission on Information, set up by statute to play watchdog and inspiration to the program, has just issued its fourth semiannual report. Headed by the distinguished journalist, Erwin D. Canham, it is a group whose experience and stature commands respect. It finds that the program is being efficiently administered; that personnel has been improved; that expansion is going forward soundly. The Commission urges strongly that Congress keep up the supply of manpower and ammunition "with which to wage the war of ideas." "To cut down the information program at this critical moment," states the report, "would be to court new disasters."

The Commission knows whereof it speaks. There is reason to doubt that the House committee has any factual information to justify its position on the Voice, and no doubt whatever that it has taken the wrong method of instituting any corrections that it may deem necessary. The House Appropriations Committee has shown how not to reduce Government expenditures; it is up to Congress as a whole to tackle the job from the right end. If the bath water must be thrown out, at least save the baby first.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION. SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS, APRIL 1951

FOREWORD

The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402) was approved by the Eightieth Congress on January 27, 1948, an act "To promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations."

Public Law 402 created the United States Advisory Commission on Information to formulate and recommended to the Secretary of State policies and programs for the carrying out of the act. It required the Commission to transmit to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of the act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as shall have been made by the Commission to the Secretary for effectuating the purposes and objectives of the act and action taken to carry out such recommendations.

This is the fourth semiannual report by the United States Advisory Commission on Information to the Congress. The third report was transmitted in July 1950.

ERWIN D. CANHAM,
Chairman.

PHILIP D. REED.
MARK A. MAY.
JUSTIN MILLER.

NOTE.—Mr. Ben Hibbs, who has been nominated recently as the fifth member of the Commission on Information, has not signed this report, since he has not yet been officially confirmed and since he feels that he is not informed sufficiently regarding the operations of the information program.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM

How are we doing in the war for the minds of men?

Should the United States information program be taken out of the Department of State and placed in a new agency, or in the Economic Cooperation Administration?

How well is the program now being administered?

Are there major organizational rearrangements which could be made inside the State Department to achieve many of the advantages of a separate agency?

Is American private enterprise given adequate channels to make its large experience available to the information program?

These and many other questions have preoccupied the United States Information Commission, set up under the Smith-Mundt Act (Public Law 402), since we presented our last semiannual report to the Congress.

Obviously, this Commission, composed of citizens who can give only part-time attention to the problems of the information program, cannot give definitive answers. But we are required under the law to advise the State Department and the Congress on the effectiveness of the information program. Therefore, this brief and summary report will present our over-all conclusions and opinions. Of course, we take no part in the administering of the program. Our opportunities for observing it are limited. But we have kept close to the program now for 2½ years. We have carefully followed up the various recommendations we have made to the State Department and to the Congress.

Our present basic conclusions are these:

That the program is being efficiently administered.

That its personnel has been greatly improved and is being steadily enriched by specialists of larger experience and talent.

That the expansion authorized by the Eighty-first Congress as the "campaign of truth" is being effectively carried forward.

That most of the recommendations made by this Commission have been put into effect.

That a great deal more can be done, and must be done, before the United States will be adequately waging the war of ideas.

That the evaluation techniques through which the Department tests its programs need further strengthening, as much as possible, through independent sources.

That grave doubts exist whether major structural changes, such as taking the program outside the State Department, will be an improvement. We are aware of the advantages of a separate agency, but we are more impressed by the disadvantages of divorcing policy making from operation and of setting up almost inevitably conflicting representation in foreign countries.

That channels which have been opened up to bring American private expertness into the program in advisory and consultative capacities show great promise of effective results.

I. What have the State Department and the Congress done to carry out our recommendations?

This Commission has made four major recommendations to the State Department and the Congress in the 2½ years of its operation:

1. That the information program must be closely integrated with policy making at all levels. This is necessary so that policy may be formulated with its informational consequences in view and so that the information people know intimately and speedily just what policy is.

2. That the program should be substantially enlarged. This was, and is, necessary so that the United States shall not lose the struggle for men's minds and for their active support.

3. That additional skilled people be brought into the program. The need for the highest talents, skills, and administrative efficiency is obvious.

4. That the program be carefully evaluated in the field. This is indispensable so that we know whether or not we are hitting the target; whether or not the people's money is being well spent.

Ties with policy making

The Commission is most gratified that its recommendations have been largely carried out. The first need, which we began pointing out in 1948, was that career and Foreign Service officers in the State Department should become conscious of the vital importance of the information program, and should cooperate effectively with it in Washington and in the field. Much progress has been made in this direction.

The Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs now participates in the formulation of policy of the Department. He advises the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and other top-level staff of the Department on public-opinion factors, domestic and overseas. A representative of the immediate staff of this Assistant Secretary participates in the meetings of the Policy Planning Staff of the Department. Through the Hoover Commission reorganization, specialists from the public affairs area have been placed in the functional or geographic divisions of the Department. All this has brought information far closer to policy making than ever before.

Nevertheless, better organizational status for the growing information program within the Department is desirable. This subject is discussed more specifically later in this report. We are not satisfied that the public affairs officers now placed in the various other divisions of the Department, and particularly operating in the field under the area Assistant Secretaries of State, have the support they require. We believe, as we state later, that more careful study must be given these organizational problems.

Obviously, to integrate this new and different kind of foreign operation—the information program—into the long-standing stereotypes of the Foreign Service is not a job to be accomplished overnight. In some areas in the field, the career men have a deep awareness of the job to be done and a real flair for its techniques. This sort of thing ought to be encouraged at every opportunity. All Foreign Service officers should be carefully briefed, and repeatedly, on the values of the information program.

A larger program

As to our second recommendation, the program's enlargement, Congress in 1950 went far in its supplemental appropriations to lay the ground work for an adequate effort. It is immensely gratifying that the real nature of the world crisis was perceived by Congress, and that enough funds to mobilize for ideological warfare were made available. This Commission has always emphasized that it is far more important to spend well than it is to spend a lot. But there is real danger now, in April 1951, that we slip back into complacency.

The situation in Korea to some seems less menacing than it did in mid-1950; the Soviet Union (as we write) has made no new dangerous gestures. Despite grave uncertainties in Iran, Yugoslavia, Indochina, and elsewhere, American public opinion—manifestly and properly reflected in Congress—is tending to cool off.

We believe, however, that Secretary Marshall was right when he said on March 27 that he regards the present situation as more dangerous than it was 6 months ago. Therefore we strongly urge that Congress keep right on providing enough ammunition and manpower with which to wage the war of ideas. To cut down the information program at this critical moment would be to court new disasters. Although the tide of Communist influence in Western Europe has been turned back, it is manifest that in vast uncommitted areas of the world, the United States has a long way to go in clarifying its

motives and its meaning to peoples. Such clarification requires a major information program. We must not stop or slow up now.

Personnel improvement

We are particularly gratified at the way in which the information program's personnel has been steadily improved. It takes a great deal of patriotic self-sacrifice for men and women who are highly skilled and highly paid professionals to leave their long-range posts and come into governmental service under conditions of uncertainty and often abuse which have prevailed in recent years. These people deserve the highest recognition and gratitude of their country. There are not a few of them. They have recognized the gravity of the world crisis and they have enlisted voluntarily in the war of ideas.

One of our members, on a recent swing around the circuit overseas, ran into men who were on leave of absence from $35,000-a-year jobs, digging into tasks at much lower levels because they have understood that this ideological conflict is no less urgent than—indeed is the very heart of—the power struggle. A good many other skilled professionals have been able to squeeze out a few weeks or months from their regular jobs to consult with the Department or to perform special tasks. All this has contributed measurably to the improvement of the staff.

But the greatest credit goes to those who have stuck by the battle through thick and thin—and sometimes it has been very thin—when complacency or unawareness spread over national thinking. Some of them have turned down very lucrative job opportunities—and this is particularly true in the radio field—just because they felt deeply and sacrificially that they were enlisted in a significant cause. We are not so naive as to ignore the presence in the information program—as in most other branches of Government—of people who do not compare in talent and skills with that required in most private industry. But, as people in private lives ourselves, we have no hesitation in saying that many of those who have taken this program through its slimmest days possess skill and ability which compare very favorably with that to be found anywhere.

It might be considered invidious to single out individuals by name. But we are quite ready to do so if Congress desires. We have formed our own opinions, on the basis of close and protracted observation, of the men carrying the most significant responsibilities. We are prepared to give candid judgments of any of them. We have freely recommended to the State Department in the past the certain individuals were in our view unsuited to their jobs. The Department has carefully listened to our advices and taken informed action.

We now understand that some of the men at the top of this program are under severe criticism in some congressional circles. We stand ready to give our evaluation of these individuals if it is desired. But we wish to state unequivocally that since the application of the Hoover Commission reorganization this program has steadily improved in its administration. We regard the keymen in the program as skilled and experienced administrators.

A prominent business and professional man, an expert in administrative organization, in response to our inquiry recently told our Commission that in his view the administrative work in this area is of high caliber and would do credit to the best organized private business. Another professional expert, commenting to us on the operations of the International Broadcasting Division, said that there are few radio administrators or engineers in the country who have capacities to excel those in charge of this operation. No doubt these two private experts, as well as many others, would be glad to testify to the business efficiency and leadership of such men as are now carrying on this far-flung program.

Naturally we are not pretending to give blanket endorsement to all the personnel. It is obvious that many of them can be improved—and are being improved—by judicious hiring and transfers. In passing, it is worth remarking that few private businesses could recruit personnel effectively if something like a 90-day wait had to take place between the moment of persuading a person to take the job and the time he was cleared for hiring. Security clearances are vital. But they render recruitment exceedingly difficult. It is to be hoped that they can be improved without reducing the safeguards.

Better evaluation

Our fourth major recommendation was of better evaluation of the target effectivness of the information program.

A year ago the Commission recommended that more attention be given to the evaluation of the impact of the program on the peoples of the world. There was at that time—and still is—need for more specific information on how the battle for men's minds is going. Are we hitting the targets toward which the outflow of information is aimed? How well is the line against the spread of communism being held? Are we winning converts from communism to freedom?

It is recognized by the Commission that these are difficult questions, but they are of immense importance for obvious reasons.

The steps taken thus far by the Department toward a more intensive and systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of the program consist of (1) the organization of an evaluation staff, at the general manager's level, composed of six members, concerned primarily with planning and conducting the over-all evaluation of the effectiveness of all media in all countries, and (2) the organization of media division evaluation staffs. The largest of these is that of the International Broadcasting Division, which now has 74 persons with provision for a total of 102 for 1951. The staffs of the other media divisions are in the process of organization. (3) The allocation of 40 positions to the research and intelligence area of the Department for purposes of providing the basic cultural anthropological research for guidance to public affairs officers; maintaining a library of sample foreign propaganda; additional biographical intelligence facilities; analyses and summaries of public-opinion surveys; surveys of world reaction to major United States policy moves; analyses of foreign propaganda content; and the collection of intelligence material for the use of USIE. (4) The allocation of USIE field staff positions to the evaluation function on a pilot-project basis. Three positions have been allocated to date, one of which is filled at this time.

At present the main activities of the central and special staffs include (1) the screening of reports from USIE field offices for instances of favorable and unfavorable responses, (2) planning studies to be done under contract by private research organizations such as opinion attitude surveys in selected foreign countries; content analyses of media output; media improvement studies; and studies to determine the local communications channels from which the target audiences form their opinions. (A number of such studies have been completed for the International Broadcasting Division).

There are two ways of assessing the effectiveness of any program of public relations, advertising, or propaganda. One is to find out if the right things are being said to the right people, in the right ways, and at the right time and through the channels that are most likely to attract attention. It is assumed at if a program comes up to certain standards of quality and quantity it is bound to be effective. The other way is to assess the results by finding out how the program influences the behavior and beliefs of those to whom it is directed. Thus far the evaluation work of the Department has been mainly of the former type. The Commission notes with satisfaction, however, that plans for 1952 call for studies, in selected areas, of the extent to which people are becoming more favorable toward the cause of freedom as expressed in words and deeds.

The Smith-Mundt Act states that the Commission is expected to report to Congress its independent appraisals, when feasible, of the effectiveness of the program. This has been done in previous reports that have been made at times when one or more members of the Commission have returned from a trip overseas and have had an opportunity for first-hand observations. Recently Judge Justin Miller has visited several USIS posts in Latin American countries. His report to the Commission is submitted as an appendix hereto.

The Commission has given considerable thought to the question of how it can manage to provide Congress with more comprehensive independent appraisals, within the limits of the time and facilities at its disposal. The Commission has neither the time nor inclination to become an operating agency, even in the vital matter of independent evaluation. Its members will however continue, when possible, to make short trips to the field.

In addition, the Commission has recommended and the State Department has set up seven advisory committee (as provided in P.L. 402). The composition and scope of these committees is described later in this report. One of their most useful consequences will be the availability of committee members for private evaluations of the information program, through their various overseas contacts and trips. On these committees are outstanding national experts in the various media. They will be able to give invaluable help in judging the effectiveness of the program according to the best known standards of communication information.

II. Should the Information Program be placed in a separate agency, or given stronger status inside the State Department?

This Commission has no vested interest in the placement of the information program. We are solely concerned with its maximum effectiveness. If we were persuaded that it could function more effectively outside the State Department, we would feel obligated to say so. But our experience has led us to have grave doubts that the program in the hands of a separate agency would operate as well as it does now. We believe the subject requires very careful study. We would therefore gladly endorse the proposals in Congress for an investigation of the information program, although we hope the investigation will not completely monopolize the time of those trying to administer these operations.

Pending the results of such an investigation, and for what it may be worth, here are our own observations based on 2½ years of scrutiny:

One vital requisite in the handling of the information program is that it shall not be remote from policy planning. Another equally significant need is that the United States abroad should speak with a single voice. There can be separate tones and modulations in that voice, and a choice of vocabularies, but the voice should not contradict itself. We do not believe that OWI operations in World War II were altogether happy as far as policy-coordination is concerned.

We recognize freely that if Congress agrees to set up an information agency of Cabinet rank, and if it creates enough top jobs at relatively good salaries, and if the right man can be persuaded to head the

agency, and if some kind of exemption from FBI clearances prior to hiring personnel can be legislated, there is a chance that the proposed agency could get better personnel than is now employed. These are big ifs.

And, of course, the separate agency would require substantially larger appropriations than are now available to the State Department, for it would require its own housekeeping arrangements and many facilities it now gets by virtue of being inside the Department. Likewise, the higher rated jobs would require a higher payroll.

These presumed advantages would not apply to the transfer of the information program to the Economic Cooperation Administration, as proposed by Senator CHAVEZ. Such a shift would not up-grade the present jobs.

But transfer to ECA, as well as to a separate agency, would inevitably tend to set up rival United States embassies in foreign capitals. One would be the regular State Department Embassy. The other would be the ECA or the information set-up. Strenuous efforts would be needed, and in the past they have not always been successful, to bridge the gulf between two such entities. Even to require that everything should clear through the regular Ambassador does not solve the problem.

Thus the chasm between the information program and policy—which this Commission has tried so earnestly to help close—would begin to yawn again. At times there would seem to be two policies—the official State Department one, and the one being promulgated by the information people. This would be a deplorable state of affairs.

No propaganda can be any stronger than the policy from which it springs. Thus the information specialists should be at all times and at all levels just as close as they possibly can be to the making of policy. Sometimes policy is made by the junior officer who writes an original memorandum. Sometimes it is made by an unexpected utterance at a top-level press conference. But the information consequences of policy ought always be taken into account, and the information man ought always to be consulted. Since most foreign policy is made by the State Department, the closer the information program can be to the State Department, the more effective the propaganda will be. This is true provided a qualified group of specialists has been organized to do the operating of the information program. That is the present case.

There is one argument for a separate agency which lies in the realm of practical politics. The State Department is a "target area," politically, and has been so in one way or another for many years. It would be refreshing to give the information program the advantages of a honeymoon period, at least, before the shafts and arrows start flying. But this is a minor advantage, after all, compared to the massive handicap of separating policy from information.

These considerations seem very important to us. But we would not be dogmatic on the question. Let it be investigated. Particularly, there should be investigation of whether the advantages—or most of them—of a separate agency can be created inside the State Department. We would be very interested in a program raising the information activities to the level of the Under Secretary of State, and giving them new administrative flexibilities they do not presently have. By the end of 1951 nearly half the employees of the State Department will be in the information program, and nearly half the Department's appropriations will be expended for that purpose. It would seem essential to give such a program appropriate organizational weight inside the Department, rather than pyramiding it under the relatively low level of an Assistant Secretary of State. We recommend this subject be carefully explored.

III. Broadening the Commission's channels to the public:

The Commission has been most desirous to carry out the purposes of Public Law 402 by opening up wider channels of contact with appropriate professional and private sources. To that end, under the authority of the act, it has recommended and the State Department has set up seven advisory committees. Personnel of three of the committees have already received preliminary clearance and they are at work. The other four are currently in process of clearance, and all will soon be complete. The committees, widely representative of each field, are:

The Radio Advisory Committee, which consists of the following persons: Judge Justin Miller, Chairman (and member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information); William S. Paley, chairman of the board, Columbia Broadcasting System; Theodore C. Streibert, chairman of the board, Mutual Broadcasting Co.; Charles Denny, executive vice president, National Broadcasting Co.; Wesley I. Dumm, president, Associated Broadcasters, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Donley F. Feddersen, president, University Association for Professional Radio Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Jack W. Harris, general manager, Station KPRC, Houston, Tex.; Henry P. Johnston, general manager, Station WSGN, Birmingham, Ala.; Edward Noble, chairman of the board, American Broadcasting Co.; John F. Patt, president, Station WGAR, Cleveland, Ohio; Mefford R. Runyon, executive vice president, American Cancer Society; G. Richard Shafto, general manager, Station WIS, Columbia, S. C.; Hugh B. Terry, vice president and general manager, Station KLZ, Denver, Colo.

The General Business Advisory Committee, which consists of the following persons: Philip D. Reed, Chairman (and member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information); James A. Farley, chairman of the board, Coca Cola Export Corp.; Ralph T. Reed, president, American Express Co.; W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of the executive committee, National City Bank of New York; Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young and Rubicam, Inc. (advertising); William M. Robbins, vice president for overseas operations, General Food Corp.; David A. Shepard, executive assistant, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; J. P. Spang, Jr., president, Gillette Safety Razor Co.; Claude Robinson, president, Opinion Research Corp.; Warren Lee Pierson, chairman of the board, Transcontinental and Western Air, Inc.; Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx.

The work of the ideological committee is devoted to the consideration of special projects, and participants in the work of this rotating committee are persons with outstanding experience in the field under study. Each meeting will consist of a new group of specialists. The first group of such specialists were: George Gallup, Institute of Public Opinion; George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia University; Allen W. Dulles, director and president, Council on Foreign Relations; Elmer Davis, news analyst, American Broadcasting Co.; Alexander Inkeles, Harvard University.

Meetings of the ideological committee, under the chairmanship of Mark Ethridge, who was chairman of the commission until December 1950, and of the general business and radio committees have already been held. Many fruitful suggestions emerged from these meetings. One of them—to illustrate—was a request by domestic radio station operators for selections from Voice of America programs so that they might let Americans know the kind of propaganda that is going overseas in their name. The Department's Division of Public Liaison is working intensively to find means of making such material available.

Preliminary clearances are under way for the proposed members of the four additional committees, namely, film committee, of which Dr. Mark May will be chairman; press and publications committee, of which Mr. Ben Hibbs will be chairman; labor committee, of which Mr. Erwin D. Canham will be chairman; and public-relations committee, of which Judge Justin Miller will be chairman.

These seven committees will greatly strengthen the commission's channels into the heart of American private enterprise, labor, and the information media. We seek to make it possible for any qualified American to get his ideas regarding this program to the attention of the proper officials. At any rate, these representative groups are spread geographically and professionally over much of the Nation, and the results are already most encouraging.

Appendix is attached hereto.

APPENDIX

REPORT TO UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

EFFECTIVENESS OF USIS OPERATIONS IN MEXICO AND BRAZIL BY JUDGE JUSTIN MILLER

My conclusions concerning the operation of the United States Information Service in Latin America are based upon first-hand contact in Mexico and Brazil, with the members of the information staff, broadcasters, and newspaper people, and Government officials of the two countries which I visited. To a lesser degree, I was able to gain some information and form some impressions concerning the situation in other Latin-American countries from my visits with broadcasters who were attending the second general assembly of the Inter-American Association of Broadcasters, in Sao Paulo, Brazil.

From all contacts mentioned above, I got the impression of a generally friendly attitude toward the United States upon the part, both of government officials and of private individuals in these respective countries. From all of them I got, also, the impression that they are looking for assistance from the United States, both economically, technically, and in all forms of professional service.

I was assured by the broadcasters of several countries, in addition to those in Mexico and Brazil, that they are hungry for American program material in the form of transcriptions and recordings; that they will be happy to give free time on their broadcasting stations for such programs; that they are receiving a good deal of such material at present from the British Broadcasting Corporation; and that the Russians would be glad to make their material available also. Generally speaking, I found little sympathy for the Russian propaganda.

Turning now to conclusions based upon my own observations in Mexico and Brazil, I will say:

1. The Voice of America is relatively unimportant in the Latin American countries because (a) of the friendly attitude concerning American programs and their availability for use on domestic radio stations; (b) the lack of short-wave receivers; (c) the availability of other very effective USIS operations.

2. I found evidences of very substantial trends toward increasing the use of American programs on domestic radio stations. In many instances, I found that time is being given free where program material is made available. In one striking instance I found that a member of the information staff is the best known and most popular commentator in the country and that his

scripts are published regularly in a large number of newspapers the day following their presentation on the air. I was given assurance by several broadcasters, not only in Mexico and Brazil, but representing other countries as well, at the IAAB conference, that they would be glad to give additional free time for this purpose. In other instances, I found that time is being purchased for very reasonable rates, and at very good hours.

My impression is that the programs which are being prepared for distribution are improving rapidly in quality, particularly where the information officers are allowed to adapt and edit the material for local consumption.

3. I found one new public information device about which I have never heard before, namely, the commercial operation, in hundreds of plazas, of public-address or loud-speaker systems. These are operated by enterprising businessmen who sell time for advertising, just as broadcasting station operators do, and who broadcast their material to the crowds sitting and standing about in the public plazas of the various cities and towns of the two countries which I visited. This, of course, meets the need upon the part of many poor people who cannot afford to own receiving sets. The operators of these systems, I am assured, are especially hungry for recordings and will use practically everything which is given to them by our information service officers.

4. Perhaps the outstanding phase of the information service in the two countries which I visited are the libraries and the institutes of cultural relations. I found here the greatest evidence of that "sympatico" which expresses cordial relations and friendly cooperation between individuals and groups of people. In the first place, the word "culture" is one of good repute in the Latin-American countries. In seems not to have suffered as the word did in the United States, following our repudiation of the German "kultur" at the time of the First World War. In these institutes of cultural relations I found participation upon the part of outstanding public officials and professional people, I found that large numbers of students are participating in the classes given in these institutes; I found extensive use of library facilities and an atmosphere of research, study, and cultural cooperation which comes closer to that which one finds about an American university or college campus than any other analogy which I can find for comparative purposes.

5. Closely related to the work of the libraries and cultural institutes, is the distribution of books, magazines, and reprints by the information officers. This work is done on a more earthy and realistic basis than is to be found in the libraries and cultural institutes. Examples could be given of very effective use of such material directly combating Communist propaganda in these countries. Here we find direct competition with Russia. In every newsstand which I saw in the several cities which I visited—and there are a surprising number of such newsstands in every city—I found liberal quantities of Russian magazines. I inquired what sale there is for such magazines and upon what basis they are handled by the news vendors, but was not able to get a satisfactory answer. There is a good deal of speculation to the effect that Russia is supplying these magazines free of charge to the news vendors and that they are taking whatever profit they can get out of those which they sell.

I was told by the information officers in each of the cities which I visited that they work under several limitations with respect to the distribution of the printed material:

(a) The material which comes from New York and Washington while good in substance is, generally speaking, too scholarly, abstruse, or conditioned for American readers, to be immediately available for distribution among the people of other countries. It needs editing and adaptation; it needs the transposing of American colloquialisms and idioms into similar colloquialisms and idioms of the countries in which distribution is made.

(b) There is a serious shortage of newsprint and of printing facilities generally. This reflects a condition which prevails throughout these countries and is evidenced by the quality of paper and quality of printing which we see in the newspapers printed in these various countries. This is something to which very serious consideration should be given. If the condition could be improved, it would assist materially, not only in the carrying on of the information program, but also in securing the good will of the several countries in Latin America so far as their own needs are concerned. The suggestion was made to me by newspaper publishers and government officials, on several occasions, that the United States might well take the lead in improving the situation with respect to newsprint and printing facilities in the various Latin-American countries on an over-all basis. This is one of the points specifically, for which aid is hoped for from the United States.

One of the most effective information services in the countries which I visited are the mobile units and the motion pictures which are shown by the crews of these units throughout the country. Because of poor transportation and communication facilities, many people in these countries have little opportunity to receive information through normal channels. One government education official told me that communication and transportation facilities are so poor that they do not even pretend to carry on education through the normal channels of school buildings, etc., and that some method must be devised for the use of broadcasting, television, motion pictures, etc., even to take care of elementary education. The mobile units of our Information Service—as will readily be seen—are a godsend under these conditions and are warmly welcomed by the government officials, especially those who are concerned with education.

Several limitations apparently exist with respect to the operation of these units. Both in Mexico and in Brazil I was told that there were insufficient numbers of the units; I was told that there are insufficient personnel and money for running expenses; I was told in Brazil that several mobile units, fully equipped, have not been put into use for almost a year, but are still standing idle because the small amount of money needed to put them into operation has not been made available.

Judging from the pictures which I was shown, of the faces of listeners, both children and adults, there can be little doubt of the effectiveness of these motion-picture presentations. I was patricularly impressed by pictures of industrial workers—among whom communism is said to spread most readily—who were watching pictures showing the life of industrial workers in the United States and the operation of modern industrial plants.

7. As previously mentioned, I found splendid cooperation—and desirable cooperation—between our information officers and educational authorities. Let me elaborate this further and specifically at this point by saying that striking examples can be given of such cooperation in such fields as agriculture, horticulture, public health, and industrial operation.

I was impressed by the fact that we have already under way in these countries, through our United States Information Service, very substantial steps in carrying out the point 4 program.

8. I was very pleasantly surprised at the high quality of personnel which I found. Several men have come recently into the service—and one woman—from much more highly paid positions in private industry, on the theory that this is a time of emergency, of approaching war and that it was an opportunity for them to render substantial service in the public interest. There is a fine enthusiasm among these people, a good deal of the know-how of private industry and a willingness to put a great deal more into the operation of the program than could be measured in terms of a 9-to-5, civil-service performance.

9. I watched, particularly, to see how the work of the Information Service is being coordinated with the over-all work of the embassies and with the Foreign Service operation. Generally speaking, I found at the top level a friendly and understanding attitude. I found some skepticism concerning the enthusiasm of the information officers—which I should commend, both because of the enthusiasm on the one side and the careful supervision which results on the other—but I found, also, some apparent road blocks resulting from unwillingness of some Foreign Service officers to accept the Information Service. I was reminded of our early contacts with Foreign Service officers in the State Department, when our Commission first began to meet and when some of these men explained to us that the task which had been assigned to them by Public Law 402 violated the first principle of the Foreign Service, namely, in requiring them to tell the world what the policy of the United States is, when through all their period of training and service they had learned to tell no one anything about such policy.

Specifically, I found this attitude upon the part of some of the Foreign Service people, causing road blocks such as the following:

(a) The failure to put the mobile units into operation in Brazil;

(b) Requiring communications between the information officer in the embassy city to go through channels to his own information officers in the consulate cities, with the result that it sometimes takes weeks to get a message to the information officer and his reply back again.

This is, of course, a touchy subject and one which involves many considerations of policy. However, it is obvious that if the Information Service is to operate effectively, these road blocks must be worked out, one way or another. One specific example will illustrate how easy it is to cause trouble. It is approximately 1½ hours by airplane from Rio to Sao Paulo. Transportation is so poor between the cities, otherwise, that ordinary mail can hardly be relied upon at all for communication between the two cities. Air mail takes as long as 1 week, sometimes. The United Press uses the telephone to connect its offices between Rio and Sao Paulo. Either a telephone service or a teletype service would make it possible to avoid severe "dating" with respect to material which is sent out from Rio to Sao Paulo. As neither a telephone service nor a teletype is permitted to the information officers, the answer is obvious.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "International information and educational activities," for facilities for radio transmission and reception, and so forth, as authorized in the third proviso under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, $9,533,939, to remain available until expended; and the limitation contained in said proviso is increased from "$41,288,000" to $50,821,939."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me assure the House that I do not qualify and do not profess to qualify as an expert concerning the ionosphere or any technical matters to which my distinguished friend, my able friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] referred. I do want to say as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as chairman of this subcommittee thereof that I feel that when we hear testimony with regard to seven certain proposed new radio facilities which were asked for last July or August, and after hearing testimony again in regard thereto only 6 or 7 months later that their "expert" estimate of cost was out by 59 percent, it is time to look over this picture.

When we find a situation with regard to their putting out a slick magazine in the Russian language called "Amerika" which some years ago was presented to this committee as a proposition which would be self-liquidating if we furnished money for it to the extent of approximately $550,000, when they represented that they could print 50,000 copies for distribution in Soviet Russia under an arrangement made previously by the distinguished gentleman Averell Harriman when he was American Ambassador to Moscow, that 50,000 copies of this magazine would be distributed and sold through a Soviet news agency; when we find that for a while this magazine program went along a hundred percent satisfactorily—and there let me say that I disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], Mr. George V. Allen, now our distinguished and capable Ambassador in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, was the finest administrator the Voice of America has had—when we find that for the next few years it was a self-liquidating proposition and that in fiscal year 1949 it cost the taxpayers only $2,200 of funds from the Treasury to get 50,000 of these magazines, instruments of propaganda, circulated in Russia, we come to the point in the first part of the year 1950 where the Soviet Government reneged on their agreement with Mr. Harriman. Instead of circulating and selling the usual 50,000 copies of the magazine Amerika they cut down the circulation to 22,000, to 18,000. The reduction in circulation has now been continued for some 13 months.

What do you think the bright gentlemen in charge of this program did? Although they knew and must have known, because they were not getting the receipts, that more than half of the 50,000 copies were returned to our embassy in Moscow, they continued to print not 50,000 but 58,000 copies, raised it by 8,000 copies mind you, so that now over a year later, as the result of their never having cut down the production in the slightest but have increased it, this item has cost the taxpayers a half million dollars.

Is that the kind of management that we want in this program? I am sure you will agree with me it is not.

They came to this subcommittee last summer with the proposition that if we would appropriate to them about $2,800,000 they could get 200,000 radios at $15 apiece and by a certain means distribute them free of charge behind the iron curtain so that people in those countries could listen to the Voice of America. What happened to that over a period of seven, eight or more months. As yet, not a single radio has been distributed. What do you think they have agreed to pay for those $15 radios? Why, when I agreed to go along on the proposition of $15 radios for free distribution I felt I was going about as far as I could go, representing the people of my district; but, without reporting back to the Congress, without any notice to us whatever, they proceeded to contract for the radios not in America as they said they were going to do but in England and at a cost of $35 apiece.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall gladly yield to the gentleman from Texas if he has a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like the gentleman to explain further the waste in reference to this program which he has elaborated upon in his report.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I think it should be said in fairness that the Bureau of the Budget imposed upon these people the necessity for spending $15,000,000 out of counterpart funds, and that is the reason they had to go to England to have the radios manufactured. I can understand that, but, of course, I cannot understand the increase in price as the gentleman has said. However, that does explain why they had to go to England to get them manufactured.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to the matter of counterpart funds, my distinguished and able friend will recall that in their presentation to the committee last summer they said they could use of the total amount requested the sum of $15,000,000 in counterpart funds.

You will find instances in the testimony with regard to their having sent magazines to Indochina, where they wound up in the scrap heap, because they were not gotten together properly and were not fit for distribution.

In regard to the advisory commission, let me point out that two distinguished Members of the other body—and if I may be permitted, I will mention their names—the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN, and the Senator from Michigan, Mr. FERGUSON, made a tour only a few months ago to the Near East and the Far East. They submitted a report to the Congress which is known as Senate Document No. 16. I would like to read to the House, if I may, just a few lines from that report in regard to the very activities with which we are now concerned:

> Everywhere in the Far East and in the Near East we saw evidences of shrewd, insidious Communist propaganda. It was handled by the natives who were won over and in Moscow educated to communism. It exploited every complaint, every hope, every fear, and every condition in each country in order to induce the people to hate America and the West, and to embrace communism.
>
> We found ample evidence that our Voice of America, our State Department, and American foreign policy have not been successful in meeting the Communist propaganda.
>
> A basic recommendation is complete reorientation of the United States Information Service, and particularly the Voice of America. Without decreasing the effective scope of the information program, it is suggested that no less than the funds now expended for the program be directed to a decentralized program, which will function primarily through or in conjunction with the diplomatic missions within the various countries involved. This is designed to achieve maximum efficiency of effort and maximum results by pin pointing objectives.

I want to give you a further instance with regard to the mentality and management ability of the very people who would handle the $97,500,000 if it were appropriated by this House. When the presentation was made to the committee last summer it was requested that a very substantial sum be allowed for anti-jamming activities. They came up here demanding money immediately and as an emergency to combat the Soviet jamming. We gave them every cent of the money. There was no contest at all about at all about it here in the House. We now find instances where those very moneys appropriated to combat the jamming were used for other purposes not at all disclosed to the Congress, without any authority, without any knowledge of any of the Members of the committee concerned. To show you how vague in knowledge of most of the details of the running of this program is the head of it, I am going to read you certain of his testimony:

> Mr. ROONEY. Now with regard to the money appropriated by the Congress and this committee for the anti-jamming operation but transferred by you for the cost of new studios—how much of that money has been expended?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. The operation to date, $200,850.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. When was that money expended?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. Down to between the end of December and the end of January.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. 1950 and 1951?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. That is right.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. During that time, except for the Christmas holidays, the Congress was in session. Is that right?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. I could not say the exact dates.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. Well, I will tell you, it was.
>
> Where were those studios installed?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. This was planning for the studios in the new building and the development of plans——
>
> Mr. ROONEY. The $200,850 you are talking about is only planning money?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. We are talking of money that has gone into architectural development lines for new electronic equipment and for a certain number of temporary studios required to meet the new program.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. How much for temporary studios and how much for planning?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. I would have to break that down for you.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. Will you do that, please. Do you have that information here?
>
> Mr. HULTEN. No.

Mr. ROONEY. Can you approximate it?

Mr. HULTEN. No; I cannot.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have any idea?

Mr. HULTEN. My report does not give that.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you not have an idea of how much money you spent for temporary studios?

Mr. HULTEN. No; I do not.

Mr. ROONEY. You do not know whether it was $10,000 or $50,000?

Mr. HULTEN. No; I do not.

Mr. ROONEY. Or perhaps $100,000?

Mr. HULTEN. I do not know the figure; I could not even guess.

Now, that is the general manager of the Voice of America, and we were discussing a very sizable amount of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman referred to the distribution of the magazine America, and that they continued to print more even when they were not able to circulate the ones they had. I know from personal knowledge that as long as 6 years ago, when my committee was in Moscow, that they were not able to distribute them then. Now I would be interested to know, and I think the House would be interested to know, the facts.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not sure that that is correct, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, because I can definitely recall that in fiscal year 1949 it only cost the taxpayers $2,200 to print and distribute 50,000 copies.

Mr. COLMER. I am not talking about that. They were not able to distribute what they did have when we were over there.

Mr. ROONEY. If I remember correctly, the gentleman and his committee went to Moscow right after the cessation of hostilities in Europe.

Mr. COLMER. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. That may have been previous to this period.

Mr. COLMER. All I am interested in knowing, and I think the House would be interested to know it, is what explanation they gave for printing these additional copies after they found out they could not distribute them.

Mr. ROONEY. None whatever, other than that they were hoping that Joe Stalin would change his mind and take the 58,000 copies.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I should like to observe that in the report that I read to the House by a member of this Commission designated by the conference, investigating the Information Service and the Voice of America in South America, a report filed with the conference this week, that the Russians, whose system the gentleman has been praising at length, send to South America all the copies of all the magazines that anybody wants, free, and do not quibble about a couple of rubles here and there, these great propagandists.

Mr. ROONEY. This is half a million American dollars. I will not quibble about a couple of million dollars here and there if I know that I am going to get a dollar's worth for a dollar. That is my position.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say to the gentleman that any reasonable man, after listening to the gentleman, can well see just why there is a lack of confidence in this House today in the Voice of America operations.

Mr. ROONEY. The following is the editorial I referred to earlier, from the Saturday Evening Post of April 7, 1951:

(By J. Anthony Marcus)

Before the echoes of the last salvos of World War II had died down, the Soviet ideological-psychological war against the free world was in full swing. Long before that, the Stalin fifth columns everywhere had been alerted to begin the offensive against existing governments and hasten the sovietization of the world. Since the war's end, the Kremlin's vicious propaganda of lies and falsifications had been marching from one triumph to another.

Belatedly our Government has awakened to the perils of the hour. But we have yet to realize that until we and our allies are fully armed, the ideological-psychological front is our most effective weapon to combat Soviet aggression. What we do or fail to do on that front will determine whether or not a catastrophic third world war will decimate populations and devastate civilization.

How are we meeting this challenge? The losses sustained since 1945, with nation after nation driven behind the iron curtain, supplies the answer. The master minds of our counteroffensive are continually urging the Congress to appropriate more and more hundreds of millions of dollars to sell America to the world. No greater fallacy could be conceived. America sold itself to the world long ago. With no costly "sell America" campaigns to urge them, millions of men and women from all corners of the globe have come streaming to our shores. I am one of these arrivals. In fact, so well did I like life in America that, despite the initial difficulties in a strange land without funds and without knowing the language, in less than 4 years I brought over my widowed mother and six brothers and sisters, paying their passage with my own savings. There was no Voice of America to tell me about the good life in America or what it stood for.

In those days we did not need State Department libraries in our homelands, stacked with books and periodicals, overstaffed with people eager to tell foreigners how pure were the motives and how noble the intentions of the American people. We did not need expensive official publications to illustrate the way people live in North Carolina or dash along the highways in expensive cars. We learned about America from the millions of letters which arrived from friends and relatives in the United States. We learned of the real America through the billions of dollars that flowed in from relatives in the U. S. A.—people who only a short time before were themselves penniless in their native countries.

Untold peoples in the countries behind the iron curtain are right now receiving food, clothing, and medicine parcels from the land which Stalin tells them to hate. Every foreign-language newspaper in the United States carries advertisements offering to guarantee the delivery of such parcels to relatives behind the iron curtain, and the irony of it is that the Soviet satellites levy high duties on the goods which these kind-hearted American relatives send back home.

Since the First World War we have poured tens of billions of dollars into those countries; we have shared generously with people in every land and clime, including Stalin's Russia, without ever asking anything in return. The peoples of the world know this far better than some of the officials in the State Department think they do.

America has sold itself to the world so well, in fact, that were we to let down our immigration bars and were Stalin to raise the iron curtain, tens of millions of people from every corner of the globe, and more especially from the sovietized countries, would come rushing to our shores on foot, in rowboats, in sailing vessels, by any and all means of transportation available, just to tread the sacred soil of America, sacred because of our free institutions and high standard of living.

To arrest the spread of the red plague and recruit crusaders in the cause of freedom, we should talk less about America and more about the miserable life behind the iron curtain. Let the hundreds of thousands of living witnesses of Soviet barbarism, the Russian men and women who have since escaped from Stalin's vast concentration camp, tell their true story. Let the former inmates of Stalin's slave-labor camps tell of the millions who have already perished and the millions who are still being exploited and starved to make room for new victims now on the way. Let them tell of the fate of the hundreds of thousands of Russian war prisoners and former slave workers in Germany upon their return to Soviet territory after 1945, and what has happened to their thousands of children. If this story is told, it will start a crusade against communism everywhere and help bring about a revolution in Russia which alone can prevent a third world war.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TWO LETTERS FROM KOREA

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a few minutes today about two recent insertions in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am alarmed about the origin of these insertions and about the fact that they have appeared in the RECORD. I have asked that the Army make an investigation for me concerning the circumstances surrounding the origin of the material in them.

The two insertions to which I refer appear in the RECORD on March 13, 1951, page A1427, and April 5, 1951, pages A1869 and A1870. The first insertion was by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] and the second by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Both insertions purport to contain letters from members of our Armed Forces in Korea. We would probably call them gripe letters, except that these letters contain vicious attacks on our armed

services and on the armed services of our allies in the battle against communism.

Most important, although these letters are supposedly from two members of our Armed Forces, written to two different newspapers in different sections of our country, they contain exactly the same charges, using identical words and phrases. It appears that there has obviously been collusion in the writing of these letters. Just as certainly it appears they are a part of some kind of planned campaign against our struggle for freedom.

We must find out who is behind this campaign. Is this Russian-inspired propaganda with our boys the unwitting tools of Communist propagandists in Korea? Or is some other group using our fighting men to undermine our military effort and influence our homefront support of the United Nations' effort? I hope that the Army, in the investigation which I have asked, will be able to answer these questions.

Any military effort, in its emphasis on victory, is bound to develop snarls and even injustices. We hear about these problems from the men in the field. The Congressman's mail bag contains many of these letters. We want to do everything to see that any injustices are righted.

This does not mean, however, that we must fall prey to organized campaigns such as the one we seem to have found here. We must be warned that those who would deny us victory in Korea are doing everything within their power to defeat us. A great deal of their effort is directed at the morale of our troops in the field and our people on the home front. The Committee on Un-American Activities of this House has just published an excellent report on the various Communist peace offensives. This report reveals that an extensive part of the Communist war of words is directed against the United Nations' and our effort in Korea. Much of the Communist propaganda has a similar ring to the material in the two letters inserted in the RECORD.

Early this year one of my constituents sent me a dispatch from a St. Louis newspaper which stated that during the evacuation of Seoul some of our enlisted men and officers were refused space on an evacuation airplane while a general used the plane to haul out his personal bathtub. I immediately had the Army investigate this story. They found out that it was a complete fabrication. At that time I pointed out that this vicious rumor appeared to be Russian inspired.

Let us beware that we do not become a party to any word-war against our military effort. We owe it to ourselves and to our country and our boys fighting in the field to make sure exactly what is behind every word we spread. We must not let partisanship or personal feelings or any other consideration blind us as to exactly what the results of our actions may be.

I am sure that the members of both sides of the House will join in making doubly sure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not become the means to carry on a propaganda barrage against the free world in its battle for peace.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For an additional amount for "Forest development roads and trails," $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take very many minutes. I realize the hour is growing late. I, too, would join with those who have preceded me in congratulating the committee on what apparently is a good job well done. I happen to be speaking at this moment relative to a domestic situation rather than a foreign issue, which seemingly has taken all of our time this afternoon. I refer primarily to chapter VI with reference to the Department of Agriculture.

I wish to call your attention to the report of the committee on page 19. I do this, not for the purpose of offering an amendment at this time, but for the sole purpose of calling your attention to the fact that apparently a subcommittee has endeavored to foreclose any further consideration of a matter which is very important in the Rocky Mountain area. I read from the second paragraph:

> The committee does not feel that additional appropriations for control of Englemann spruce bark beetle are justified in view of the present admission of the high cost of the program, particularly in relation to the value of the timber involved, and because it is doubtful that the project can ever be successfully completed. It is of the opinion that no further work should be done on this project.

I read now the following paragraph, which calls attention to a similar project in another part of the country:

> The committee agrees with continuation of the spruce budworm project in view of the high timber values involved and the good prospects for successful completion at a reasonable cost and concurs in the proposal to release funds from the contingency fund.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal which is made relative to the spruce bark beetle can only have been made because of a lack of knowledge of the great resource values in the Colorado Rockies of this particular natural resource.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report not merely disapproves the $345,000 for insect control in the national forests of Colorado during the balance of this fiscal year but it also rules that this work must be completely discontinued for the future.

That proposal can only have been made because of lack of knowledge of the great resource values in the Colorado Rockies. I know that country very well. It is my home. Others of you who have been there will recall the heavily forested and beautiful mountains that are endangered by this infestation. Few of you, however, can realize that the infestation endangers a strip of forested land 300 miles long, extending from northern New Mexico through the full length of Colorado and into southern Wyoming. Some of the areas are intermittent, but mainly it is a long, continuous area, including 2,000,000 acres in spruce timber in Colorado alone.

Congress has been wise over the years in providing needed funds for forest fires. We would not tolerate for a moment a forest fire extending over any such great area as this. Insects will devastate these forested lands just as badly as do forest fires. We just must not allow that devastation to continue if it is humanly possible for us to stop it.

As pointed out last year when funds were provided to start this work, three very great values are endangered:

First. Sixteen billion board feet of timber value at $100,000,000. As has been pointed out repeatedly, much of the strength of this Nation is in the strength of its natural resources. This is one big section of those resources which we can save by continuing the work started last year.

Second. The second great value endangered is the watersheds of the upper Colorado and Platte Rivers.

Third. The third great value is the beauty of the Rocky Mountain National Park and of the Colorado Rockies generally. As many of you know, this country provides the only reasonably accessible, cool mountain retreat to millions of people in the adjacent Plains States. It is a highly valued scenic spot to people from all parts of the Nation. As previously urged, this country just must not be allowed to become a vast graveyard of whitened gray snags.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to the size of the area involved. This area is approximately one-fourteenth of the total area of the district which I represent. The area is three times the size of the entire State of Rhode Island, or almost twice the size of the State of Delaware, and a little over one-half the entire area of the State of Connecticut. This is not a question related only to the State of Colorado. One-half of the lands in my district belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Can the gentleman give us some estimate of the value of the spruce timbers that have already been killed?

Mr. ASPINALL. The estimated value of the timber that has already been killed is approximately $16,000,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And if this program is not continued, what will be the result? And by the way, it has been carried out for a number of years, has it not?

Mr. ASPINALL. No, this last year was the only time we have had this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will you tell us what the loss will be to the timber if this program is not carried out?

Mr. ASPINALL. The total loss will be in the neighborhood of $100,000,000, and if the program is not carried on for the next 5 years the loss will be $400,000,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What will be the effect on the watershed?

Mr. ASPINALL. The watershed will be destroyed to a great extent. May I say here that 500,000 acres of land have already been denuded of valuable timber resources. That much watershed is being destroyed at the present time. That is the watershed which carries water down to California and the lower basin States, through the Colorado River. If this program against the spruce bark beetle infestation is not continued there will be approximately 2,000,000 acres of land, which is an area of land, as I said, larger than many of our sister States in the East, that will be destroyed of its valuable watersheds. I am not offering an amendment this afternoon, but I do wish the RECORD to show that there is another side to this question.

I desire to include additional information pertinent to the issues involved:

WORK ACCOMPLISHED TO DATE

During the treating season of 1950, 784,072 trees were successfully treated. The average cost per tree treated was $2.25 as compared to an estimate of $4 per tree. This project was financed by a deficiency appropriation of $2,000,000 which was enacted on June 27, 1950. It was possible to conduct the treating program from approximately July 1 until the latter part of September when adverse weather conditions made further work inadvisable.

The deficiency appropriation is available for expenditure until June 30, 1951. There is approximately $150,000 in this appropriation available to get work started this spring. Work is now under way in the Denver office to have camps ready for early installation and to conduct other preparatory measures necessary to get the earliest practicable start when weather conditions become favorable. A thorough survey of the insect populations was made last fall, and additional surveys are now under way to determine the extent of winter-killed beetles from the abnormally low temperatures this winter and from woodpecker activities.

The work in 1950 conclusively demonstrates that the spruce bark beetle can be successfully treated in large numbers under the field conditions which exist in the areas presently infested. Costs per treated tree were much lower than had been anticipated.

The survey in the fall of 1950 indicated there are approximately 1,500,000 infested trees which were attacked in 1950 exclusive of the South Rabbit Ears area. This latter area is not scheduled for treatment because mass migrations out of it are not anticipated. In addition there are approximately 500,000 infested trees attacked in 1949 which it was not possible to treat last year.

PLAN OF WORK FOR 1951

It is proposed to schedule $3,895,000 for treatment of 1,643,000 trees in the season of 1951. It is proposed to finance this work in the following manner:

From the deficiency appropriation of June 27, 1950	$150,000
From supplemental appropriation (H. Doc. No. 67 of Mar. 1, 1950, p. 9)	345,000
From regular fiscal year 1952 pest control appropriation (H. Doc. No. 66 of Mar. 1, 1951, p. 5)	3,400,000
Total	3,895,000

House Document No. 67 of March 1, 1951—page 9—contains a supplemental estimate of $370,000 for forest-pest control. Of this amount $345,000 was included for the Colorado-spruce bark-beetle project for the period ending June 30, 1951.

House Document No. 66 of March 1, 1951—page 5—contains a budget amendment for the fiscal year 1952 for forest-pest control. The amount provided for the Colorado-spruce bark-beetle project in the budget amendment is $3,750,000 for the period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952. The division of the cost by seasons is $3,400,000 for the period July 1 to December 31, 1951, and $350,000 for the spring season of January 1 to June 30, 1952.

The House Appropriations Committee report issued April 6 on the third deficiency appropriation fails to include provision for the $345,000 requested in House Document No. 67. A copy of the committee's comments on the Colorado-spruce bark-beetle project is attached.

ESTIMATE FOR TOTAL PROJECT

In the season of 1951 it is proposed to treat 1,643,000 trees at a cost of $3,895,000. It is expected that it will be necessary to treat 1,500,000 trees in the season of 1952 at a cost of $3,600,000. In the season of 1953 to 1956, inclusive, it will probably be necessary to treat an additional 600,000 trees at a cost of around $1,500,000 in order to complete control. The total number of trees which remain to be treated before control is obtained is, therefore, approximately 3,750,000 at an estimated future cost of $9,000,000. The estimated cost of controlling this epidemic, including work done in the season of 1950, is approximately $11,000,000 for the treatment of about 4,500,000 trees.

PULP PLANT DEVELOPMENT

A certificate of necessity to the Columbine Development Co. was issued on March 31 for the construction of 225-ton daily capacity pulp mill to utilize insect-killed spruce timber. This company holds a preliminary award for 4,565,000 cords of dead and green pulp timber in the national forests of the western slope of Colorado. The contract price for this timber is $3.10 per cord, the equivalent of $6.20 per thousand board feet.

Permanent operation of a pulp mill in western Colorado is dependent on the successful control of this spruce bark beetle epidemic. Otherwise the 16,000,000,000 feet of spruce timber in Colorado may all be killed within the next few years. There would be no possibility to grow a new crop to size ready for harvesting during the period in which salvage operations of dead timber would be feasible. I am advised that the Department of Commerce has today approved the request of the Columbine Development Co. for a defense production loan in a size sufficient to guarantee the immediate and final construction of the paper pulp mill and that revenues will in a short time start coming into the Federal Treasury from the sale of timber to such mill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. WHITTEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The limitation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$16,350,000" to "$19,100,000."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: On page 11, line 23, after the word "to" strike out "$19,100,000" and insert "$18,350,000."

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this proposed amendment to strike $750,000 from this item may seem to some relatively unimportant, yet I think it is a matter of definite importance. I have offered this amendment for the purpose of focusing attention upon this particular operation in our Government and to enable us to save some money in a clearly nondefense item.

The committee is to be commended for doing what it did. It was asked to authorize $3,850,000 for this item. In the committee report on page 20 there is this language:

While the committee recognizes the need for some additional funds for this purpose, it does not feel that it can recommend more than $2,750,000—

And this is important—

in view of the decreased demands which will be made upon the Corporation in the future due to the change from surpluses to shortages in many agricultural commodities.

I have read the hearings carefully and I find very little in the hearings that would justify any specific figure. I do not know whether it should be $2,750,000, $2,000,000, $1,500,000, or $1,000,000, or some other figure, particularly in view of the testimony that was provided by way of a supplementary report from the Secretary of Agriculture in reply to an inquiry of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], as to the realized loss of this program. The realized loss for fiscal 1949 was given at $254,761,994.

I try to follow the reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation as frequently as they are issued. The last one I think made available to the Congress was for the month of January. One very significant fact made clear from that report on milk, butter, cheese, dried eggs, is that for the total of 7 months of the cur-

rent fiscal year ending January 31, the total loss in these four commodities was $112,670,971.37. If it is running at that rate on only four commodities, then I submit the time has come now when we are entitled to know what the basic facts are with reference to the operation of this program of purchasing storable and edible food commodities, laying them to one side, making them unavailable to the people of this country or anywhere else, and eventually selling them at substantial losses.

I submit it is time for us to take a good look at that program. I know that is not the first responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations, but sooner or later I believe the public is going to demand that this be done.

Next, I have read items in the newspapers recently, and I think many of you have, indicating that in connection with butter and dried eggs, and probably in connection with dried milk also, practically all of the existing stores have been disposed of. If that is true, then, certainly, the cost of operation ought to decrease and not increase.

Now, finally, within a week or 10 days it has been reported that the Department is now engaged in buying up more butter. Consequently, I submit to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the members of this committee that a reduction of $750,000, leaving them something in the neighborhood of $2,000,000, is within the realm of fair dealing with this particular agency, and they ought to come up before this bill passes through the legislative processes with some facts we can all understand so that Congress can take intelligent action which can be defended. It should not be forced to appropriate money in the dark.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. WHITTEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 55, noes 48.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. HESELTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 57.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE LATE BOB JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that I apprise the membership of the House of the death of our loyal friend and devoted employee, Bob Johnson, who died yesterday.

Bob was never married. He had no immediate relatives. The men of the House were "his family." I am certain that all of us will learn with profound regret of the passing of this faithful retainer.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for this afternoon be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection on the part of the gentlemen who have special orders for this afternoon, and if there is no objection otherwise, the gentlewoman may proceed.

There was no objection.

CRITICISM BY GREAT BRITAIN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much shocked at the action of Great Britain in criticizing General MacArthur for stating his views, or criticizing anyone in our country. Great Britain, least of all, is in a position to criticize. She has only a token number of men in Korea and she is trying to take them out of Korea. More than that, she has persistently shipped materials and munitions of war to Russia, and the Red countries that are attacking and killing our men. It is high time Great Britain stopped weakening the United States and also stopped attacking our great general.

Is it good faith to accept Marshall-plan aid from the United States and then transship it to Communist China in order to create good will between Great Britain and Communist China?

The time has come that if the war in Korea is successfully terminated all the members of the United Nations including Great Britain should carry their share of the load. A war cannot be won with talk. It requires brave men and a courageous nation behind them. It is my view that Great Britain should do less talking and more acting. The British Government through its Ambassador to Washington has shown extremely bad taste in making any representation except a praiseworthy one of the greatest generals of his time, Douglas MacArthur.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DENNY asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore granted, and to revise and extend his remarks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PAUL DILLON

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, some remarks were made on the floor of the House concerning St. Louis and Paul Dillon. Being from St. Louis, I feel it proper that I should make some additional remarks. I regret to say that most of the facts brought out by those people were true. Furthermore, Mr. Dillon happens to have been a campaign manager for Mr. Truman in St. Louis. He also is reported in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on February 18, 1948, to have made a social call on Mr. and Mrs. Truman in the White House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the gentleman's request at this time, but then the Chair is going to recognize the other gentlemen who have special orders.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INTER-AMERICAN UNITY AND LA PRENSA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the United States and the representatives of the other 158,000,000 Americans in Latin America signed the Declaration of Washington dealing with the security of the Western Hemisphere and hemisphere solidarity in the face of the Communist threat against that security.

Let us hope that the people of all the Americas and of Argentina will understand that inter-American unity requires also unity for the principles of free elections, free speech, freedom of the press and freedom of thought and religion and that the strength of the freemen who are struggling for freedom's voice will be fortified by this act of inter-American unity. The suppression by government action—open or covert—of the publication of Dr. Gainza Paz' great, independent newspaper, La Prensa, in Buenos Aires makes this injunction necessary.

We have learned bitter lessons from the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini and from the current dictatorship of Stalin's Politburo in the U. S. S. R. and its satellites that "means" are vitally important—it applies to dictatorships wherever located—for under cover of a stated objective of peace and freedom these dictatorships have been used, we have found, ruthlessly to suppress freedom and freemen for decades. "Remember La Prensa!" may yet turn out to be a

rallying cry for freedom in this hemisphere.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I as unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REFERENCES TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I just heard some remarks made by the gentleman from Missouri about a man by the name of Dillon. Then the President's name was brought in, and then a visit to the President and Mrs. Truman by this man, and then period. I wonder what the gentleman had in mind. To me it is loathsome and low and mean and contemptible for anybody—I am not saying that the gentleman did it—but for anybody to make a personal attack directly or indirectly on any President of the United States. I think the gentleman from Missouri owes an obligation to himself as one who purports to be an honorable gentleman to frankly state what he means, rather than by innuendo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at that part of the RECORD where section 3 of the supplemental appropriation bill was under consideration, and where I made some remarks under the 5-minute rule, I may extend my remarks and insert certain newspaper articles, editorials, and a report dealing with the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the United States should renounce the 1947 Italian Peace Treaty. It has been harshly restrictive, unfair, and dangerous for Italy since its inception; it is a harshly restrictive, an unfair, and a dangerous treaty today for the whole free world. Particularly is it dangerous today to our attempts to develop military strength for the defense of the west against the threat of Soviet land power.

It is today this country's first aim to build up, as quickly and as effectively as possible, a combined Western European military defense system sufficiently powerful to deter the Russians from resorting to force in that area.

Each of the 11 European member nations of the North Atlantic Pact is a link in this chain of resistance. The importance of France and Great Britain is obvious. But it is well to direct fresh attention to the immense importance of Italy. Consider if Italy was under the military domination of the Russians and the Italian Communist Party were in positions of control in Rome instead of Signor de Gasperi and his Christian Democrat, Socialist, and Republican Ministers. The security of Europe would be undermined, the position of Greece and Turkey would be endangered, and the west's control of the Mediterranean and of north Africa would be neutralized.

Fortunately, this is not now the case. But both inside and outside Italy the defenders of freedom still need to do all in their power to support and sustain the present democratic Government in Rome.

The people of Italy, themselves, who have brought their country under De Gasperi's leadership so well through the difficult postwar days, need to know better and to understand the growing strength of that west to which their destiny is now bound. Equally, their own position and problems need to be known and understood and appreciated in the rest of the Western World, both for the contribution which they are making and will make to the common security of the North Atlantic Treaty members.

What of Italy's contribution to the common security? How strong a partner can we expect her to be in the critical Western European rearmament program?

Nine articles of the 1947 peace treaty can best answer those questions:

First. Article 47, permanent Italian fortification and military installations along the French-Italian border and their armaments shall be destroyed or removed.

Second. Article 48, permanent Italian fortifications and military installations along the Italian-Yugoslav frontier shall be destroyed or removed.

The following construction to the west of the Italo-Yugoslav frontier is prohibited: Permanent fortifications where weapons capable of firing into Yugoslav territory or territorial waters can be employed; permanent military installations capable of being used to conduct or direct fire into Yugoslav territory or territorial waters.

In a coastal area 15 kilometers deep, stretching from the frontier between Italy and the free territory of Trieste to the latitude of 44° 50′ north, and in the islands adjacent to this coast, Italy shall not establish any new, nor expand any existing, naval bases or permanent naval installations.

Third. Article 51, Italy shall not possess, construct, or experiment with, one, any atomic weapon; two, any self-propelled or guided missiles or apparatus connected with their discharge; three, any guns with a range of over 30 kilometers; four, sea mines; or, five, torpedoes.

Fourth. Article 54, total number of heavy and medium tanks shall not exceed 200.

Fifth. Article 58, no battleship shall be constructed, acquired, or replaced by Italy. No aircraft carrier, submarine, or other submersible craft, motor torpedo boats, or specialized types of assault craft shall be constructed, acquired, employed, or experimented with by Italy.

Total standard displacement of the war vessels, other than battleships of the Italian Navy, shall not exceed 67,500 tons.

Sixth. Article 60, total personnel of the Italian Navy shall not exceed 25,000 officers and men.

Seventh. Article 61, the Italian Army, including the frontier guards, shall be limited to a force of 185,000 combat, service, and overhead personnel, and 65,000 carabineri.

Eighth. Article 64, the Italian Air Force shall be limited to a force of 200 fighter and reconnaissance aircraft, and 150 transport, air-sea rescue, training, and liaison aircraft, including reserve aircraft.

Ninth. Article 65, the personnel of the Italian Air Force shall be limited to a total of 25,000.

It is plain from these crippling restrictions, that if the treaty were being adhered to, Italy not only could not be expected to contribute effectively to Western European defense, but could not even adequately defend her own borders from aggression.

It is indeed paradoxical that Italy, so hamstrung by this treaty which has proved itself to be unjust and unrealistic, is 1 of the 12 member nations of the North Atlantic Pact. For the current fiscal year Congress has appropriated over $4,500,000,000 to assist these countries under the military-aid program. The amount of aid planned to be extended to Italy is substantial.

This fact alone makes it difficult for me to understand why the United States has not renounced the peace treaty. This Nation cannot, certainly in conscience, pretend to abide, on the one hand, by a treaty which so severely limits Italy's defense rearmament and, on the other give assistance, probably in hundreds of millions of dollars, to the present Italian-defense program.

It may be argued that there is no immediate need for lifting the treaty's military restrictions because Italy is still below her treaty strength. There is no doubt, however, that before too long, probably by next fall, these restrictions will seriously hamper Italy's getting on with her defense program. She is trying herself, as evidenced in the $400,000,000 she has recently appropriated for defense expenditures this year. And in a conversation with Defense Minister Paccardi in Rome this winter, he was optimistic in his hopes for developing an effective defense organization.

But he also pointed out the bad psychological effect of the peace treaty on Italy's rearmament efforts—when on the one hand the Italians are being urged to sacrifice their hard-won economic recovery for rebuilding defense forces, by the same Western Powers who, on the other hand, are limiting through the treaty the size that these defense forces may attain.

In regard to the possibility of a renunciation of the treaty's restriction of Italy's armed strength provoking Russia, it is well to note the situation among Soviet satellites who were former enemies. Rumania was authorized 138,000 men in her treaty; Bulgaria 65,500. United States officials have estimated that Rumania today has 275,000 men

Please return to
DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE REPORTS
Office of Budget and Finance

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1951 No. 64

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, grant that during this day we may have a new and worthier appreciation of life and all our blessings, for we penitently confess that we are frequently guilty of the sacrilege of an ungrateful and indiffent spirit.

Inspire our minds and hearts with thoughts of Thy greatness and the inexhaustible riches of Thy grace as we strive to build a finer social order and a nobler civilization.

We pray that when we are discouraged and are tempted to yield to despair we may hear Thy voice awakening within us the glad assurance that Thy divine purposes can never be defeated.

May our beloved country continue to be a strong link in the chain of peace-loving and peace-making nations who are daily praying and laboring for the fulfillment of that blessed day of prediction when the black demon of war shall be forever destroyed.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 349. An act to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H. R. 2612) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 30, noes 13.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 278, nays 115, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—278

Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Angell
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Beamer
Beckworth
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Betts
Blackney
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton
Bosone
Bow
Bramblett
Bray
Breen
Brehm
Brownson
Buckley
Budge
Buffett
Burnside
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carnahan
Case
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clemente
Cole, Kans
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crosser
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denny
Denton
Devereux
Dollinger
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Doyle
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Elston
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz
Gavin
Goodwin
Gordon
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hunter
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
James
Jarman
Javits
Jenison
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Latham
Lesinski
Lind
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMullen
McVey
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Murdock
Murphy
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
Ostertag
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Poulson
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quinn
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ramsay
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.

Rogers, Mass.	Spence	Welch
Rooney	Springer	Werdel
Sadlak	Staggers	Wharton
St. George	Stigler	Whitten
Saylor	Stockman	Wickersham
Scott, Hardie	Taylor	Widnall
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Thompson, Mich.	Wier
Scudder	Thompson, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Seely-Brown	Thornberry	Williams, N. Y.
Sheehan	Towe	Wilson, Ind.
Sheppard	Vail	Wilson, Tex.
Simpson, Pa.	Van Pelt	Wolverton
Sittler	Van Zandt	Yates
Smith, Miss.	Vaughn	Yorty
		Zablocki

NAYS—115

Aandahl	George	Rankin
Abbitt	Golden	Reed, N. Y.
Abernethy	Grant	Rees, Kans.
Allen, Ill.	Gregory	Richards
Andersen, H. Carl	Gross	Riley
Anderson, Calif.	Harris	Roberts
Andresen, August H.	Harrison, Va.	Robeson
Andrews	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Barden	Hill	Sabath
Bates, Ky.	Hoeven	Schwabe
Battle	Hoffman, Mich.	Scrivner
Belcher	Hull	Shafer
Bennett, Fla.	Jenkins	Short
Berry	Jensen	Sikes
Bishop	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Ill.
Bonner	Jones, Hamilton C.	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Va.
Brown, Ohio	Larcade	Smith, Wis.
Bryson	LeCompte	Stanley
Burdick	Lovre	Steed
Burleson	McCulloch	Stefan
Camp	McGregor	Sutton
Cannon	McMillan	Taber
Carlyle	Magee	Tackett
Clevenger	Marshall	Talle
Cole, N. Y.	Martin, Iowa	Teague
Cooper	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas
Cunningham	Morris	Trimble
Curtis, Nebr.	Murray, Tenn.	Velde
Davis, Ga.	Norblad	Vinson
DeGraffenried	Norrell	Vorys
D'Ewart	O'Hara	Vursell
Dolliver	O'Toole	Weichel
Doughton	Passman	Wheeler
Elliott	Patman	Williams, Miss.
Fellows	Phillips	Willis
Gary	Pickett	Winstead
Gathings	Polk	Withrow
		Wood, Idaho

NOT VOTING—40

Allen, La.	Frazier	Redden
Anfuso	Gillette	Roosevelt
Armstrong	Gore	Sasscer
Bakewell	Hébert	Secrest
Boykin	Kee	Shelley
Brooks	Keogh	Sieminski
Buchanan	Mansfield	Tollefson
Chenoweth	Miller, Md.	Walter
Cox	Morton	Whitaker
Dawson	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Dingell	O'Konski	Wood, Ga.
Dorn	O'Neill	Woodruff
Fine	Potter	
Fogarty	Reams	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Fine with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Chenoweth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 185.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Tuesday, April 17, 1951, for the celebration of Pan-American Day on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is similar to a resolution which is adopted by the House every year?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 153 (B) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3196) to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he will give us an explanation with reference to this bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a short explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3196 should be enacted by Congress prior to April 15. The purpose of the bill is simply to make it unnecessary for trusts under which all the net income must be distributed currently to file the special return required by section 153 (b) of the code. Under regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue these returns are due on April 15.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, it involves no loss of revenue since it deals only with the requirement of furnishing information returns, and it has the approval of the Treasury Department.

H. R. 3196 amends section 153 (b) of the code, which section was enacted by the Congress in the Revenue Act of 1950 as a part of its tax program to prevent unreasonable accumulations of income of trusts. Section 153 (b) requires in effect that trusts which claim charitable deductions must file an information return containing certain detailed information regarding the operation of the trusts. However, as presently enacted section 153 (b) applies also to trusts in which the income for trust accounting purposes must be distributed currently to the taxable beneficiary. In other words, in these cases the trustee has no discretion to accumulate the income, and in these cases no purpose is served by giving the charitable beneficiary of the trust information which would enable it to put pressure upon the trustee to distribute accumulated income. This bill simply provides that in the cases where the net income must be distributed currently there is no obligation upon the trustee to file the special return required by section 153 (b) of the code. Furnishing the information required under section 153 (b) in these cases would involve an exhaustive analysis of innumerable trusts and the making of complex calculations which would cast a very heavy burden and a considerable expense upon fiduciaries. Since the furnishing of information in these cases would not accomplish any useful purpose, it is important to relieve fiduciaries of this unnecessary obligation as provided for in this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special returns required from trusts claiming charitable, etc., deductions under section 162 (a) of such code) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"This subsection shall not apply in the case of a taxable year if all the net income for such year, determined under the applicable principles of the law of trusts, is required to be distributed currently to the beneficiaries."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3587, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through page 11 of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I may have the attention of the Members because I

think this is important to each of you. On yesterday this Committee adopted an amendment reducing the funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation for the remainder of this fiscal year. I do not believe that we did too good a job of getting over to you what the full import of this will mean to each of you and to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been operating on a deficiency basis since the beginning of the fiscal year. This was aproved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under authority to apportion funds on a deficiency basis when necessary to do so to protect life or property. In this case Federal property, represented by commodity stocks of over $2,000,000,000 was at stake. In view of this situation, any reduction in the amount contained in this bill would require the release of additional employees. This further reduction of $750,000 for the fiscal year will require the release of another 1,000 to 1,300 employees, approximately 30 percent of the personnel working for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I make no plea here for those employees, because they can go right on to defense jobs but I would like to direct your atttention to the workload and what the effect of this will be. To me this is of real importance.

On April 9 the inventories on hand with the Commodity Credit Corporation were valued at $1,447,681,000. This includes 418,000,000 bushels of corn, 180,000,000 of wheat, 31,000,000 bushels of other grains, 9,900,000 hundredweight of grain sorghums, 390,000,000 pounds of seed, 513,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, 30,000,000 pounds of dry milk and 158,000,000 pounds of rosin. There are 10,000 warehouses with which the Commodity Credit Corporation now has to work out the details on of paying storage and closing out these accounts for the volume of commodities that have gone through. The effect of your vote yesterday—and goodness knows there is not a man in this House that has done more to reduce personnel than I have, and I mean that—in cutting this out, will delay the settlement of these accounts, and you are going to hear from the farmers throughout this country because you are putting off for 6 or 8 months the settlement of these accounts.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I just want to say to the gentleman that I have taken occasion this morning to look into this situation myself, and I feel the same concern that he does as to the effect of this amendment. What it really amounts to, as I understand, is a 30 percent reduction in operating funds for the remainder of this year, and a corresponding cut in personnel.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman—and there is no abler nor sounder Member of Congress—is certainly correct. I would like to say that there are 300,000 grain accounts that have got to be handled. They have to go through the volume of their business and determine the amount of warehousing charges, the amount of storage, the amount of freight, and the date of delivery. They have to do all of those things in effecting settlements. There is but one way to get at this vast volume of work that is in the Commodity Credit Corporation; you have to do it with people, and you have to pay those people. You either do it the way we are trying to do it or you do it anyway. We are trying to catch up with this back-log of more than 37,000 accounts by letting them have enough folks to do it by July 1. If you make us carry it over until next year, you will have to have an additional number of employees above what we expect to recommend on the payroll for an entire fiscal year.

I can tell you that this committee is just as economy-minded as you are. I think I will take the opportunity to tell you that our subcommittee is of the opinion and expects to take appropriate action to cut the Commodity Credit Corporation by $4,000,000 in administrative funds for the next fiscal year. But it would be false economy to tie up the farmers of this country at a time when you are trying to get them to increase production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I wish the gentleman would explain to the Members why the committee reduced the estimated amount by $1,100,000 if it is so essential that they have these employees.

Mr. WHITTEN. Just because we are just like the gentleman from Massachusetts, we want to cut just as far as we feel we can afford to, but we think we have gone that far. We do think, with all due deference to my friend from Massachusetts, that we are in a little better shape to pass judgment after listening to all the details. I think the gentleman will be frank to say that he is not too familiar with the details of this proposition, and not being on this particular committee, he has not had the same opportunity to know, except that in his heart he wants to reduce Federal expenditures. He offered an amendment and if I may express my opinion, to his surprise, it was adopted.

Mr. HESELTON. It is quite possible that it was to my surprise, but I hope I will be further surprised today in that the House will continue to consider the advisability of reducing nonessential Federal expenditures.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will agree with every word the gentleman has said. When he used the word "nonessential" he hit me just exactly where I stand. But I am saying that this amendment is false economy. When you have about $2,000,000,000 worth of commodities, when you have to handle them, when you have 300,000 grain accounts alone, not to mention cotton, linseed oil, eggs, resin, and seeds, you have a big business that has to be properly operated, and this committee is trying to provide for that without an extra dollar.

I should like to point out, and this is no threat, that you took rather untimely action a few years ago on warehousing with the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it did not work out so happily for my good friends on the left. I mention that because here again, if you do not—and I expect to ask for a roll call at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill—go along with letting us move these commodities out in a proper way, clearing out these records to make proper settlement with the farmers throughout the country, you are not saving money, because we are going to cut these employees off the 1st of July.

May I point out to you, too, that this settlement date is April 30 on many other things in the Department. If they do not have the people with whom to do the work, that, too, is going to have to be delayed 6, 8, or 9 months.

Many of you come from consumer areas. I know the cost of living is high because it affects me, too. But I am saying that it is not good at a time when we are asking the farmers to produce beyond anything they have ever produced in the past to hamstring and delay a settlement, particularly when you can effectuate it and make it now more cheaply than you can if you let everything go ahead.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that if we reduce the number of employees it will delay the disposition of thousands of tons of materials and goods which are now in warehouses and which it is costing the country, unnecessarily, millions of dollars each year for storage?

Mr. WHITTEN. In my judgment if you make this reduction it will cost you at least 5 to 25 times more money than you will save. That is borne out by the records of this committee. I am placing these facts before you now so that you may vote, as I believe you should when we get a separate vote at the conclusion of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What I gather from what the gentleman is saying is that this organization is so large now that they need all these employees to close out the accounts. That is what you are telling us, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; I am trying to say to you that this organization is so large and has such a volume of business that it takes quite a number of employees to handle the business. They have already laid off four or five hundred employees. Why make further reductions? This will not add a single person to the organization. This will let them keep about two-thirds of the people that they have, people who are entirely familiar with this job and the idea is to have that

many people so that they can catch up with the job by the first of the next fiscal year. We have to do the work. People have to do the work and you have to pay them. We are trying to keep enough of them so that they can clean up the backlog by the first of July. Therefore they will not have to carry too many people through the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How long is that condition going to continue? Are we ever going to have a chance to cut down on them?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am advising the gentleman that the subcommittee has made certain recommendations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I know that; they want economy, but when are we going to have a chance to cut down on them?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know how many times I have to repeat it so that the gentleman will understand it, but we are cutting out $4,000,000 in the next year's appropriation, or at least we are recommending that to the Congress. I trust the gentlemen will vote for that reduction.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that the only cut that can be made?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman sees fit, he can offer a motion to cut it out entirely. I do not agree with him, but he can offer a motion to eliminate the Commodity Credit Corporation entirely. But if he does, I think he will rue the day that he did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I am being called away from the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent to take up, out of order, an amendment to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 18, line 7, strike out "$38,000,000" and insert "$33,029,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the appropriation by approximately $5,000,000. It is offered in compliance with a voluntary reduction suggested by the Office of Price Stabilization. The committee is now informed that since the date of the hearings recruitment of personnel has lagged to the extent that the amount of $20,679,000 will be adequate to carry this agency through the balance of the fiscal year. The reduced amount is the full amount requested by the Office of Price Stabilization for the balance of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I offered the amendment to which the gentleman from Mississippi has addressed himself, I think I should say something about the amendment, explain what I think it means and why I think you should vote for it. If you look at the committee report, you will see a request was made for $3,850,000. The committee says this about the justifications:

While the committee recognizes the need for some additional funds for this purpose, it does not feel that it can recommend more than $2,750,000, in view of the decreased demands which will be made upon the Corporation in the future—

And this is important—

due to the change from surpluses to shortages in many agricultural commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I submit, if you read the committee hearings, you will come to the same conclusion I did, that this Corporation simply did not justify its request, and that the committee very properly, in my judgment, reduced it substantially to the extent of $1,100,000.

Certainly the question arises why so dire results would come from a saving of an additional $750,000 with apparently no protest coming from downtown as to the elimination of $1,100,000 by the committee. Could it be that the original request was padded by over a million dollars. I offered the amendment to reduce it an additional $750,000 primarily because I insist that there was no adequate justification, until the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] took the floor this morning and very ably and very fairly placed the case before the House. I do not know whether it is possible to sustain judgment against the amendment on the basis of what the gentleman offered us this morning. I suspect that the Corporation became very much concerned after we acted yesterday. I submit it should be concerned when it is asking this House to appropriate $2,375,000 without making more of an explanation than appears in the hearings. That may be a small amount in terms of what we are asked to do everyday when appropriation bills are considered, but I think the adoption of the amendment should be a warning to this agency and every other agency in this Government of ours than in these days, when we are piling a load on the taxpayers of this country which they can hardly stand, they must justify fully their requests before any committee.

I have tried to follow the activities of this Corporation for over a year. Last year this House unanimously passed a bill which would have helped us to liquidate this whole program, as far as edible food commodities are concerned, and some of the losses which this Corporation has placed on the taxpayers of this country which are still continuing at a staggering rate. I have taken into consideration in the main such commodities as dried milk and eggs, cheese and butter, up through January of this year. In handling these four commodities they have incurred a loss of $104,327,731.98. When I mention this loss I am not speaking of the other results, although I am fully cognizant that this particular Corporation could not have done these things without contributing materially to the high cost of living that everybody is paying, farmers, consumers, and everybody else. I say it is time for us to give a note of sharp warning to this agency that they have to revise their activities.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] says that this is a liquidation program. I hope that will be the case. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if this particular Corporation is not back in the field now buying hundreds of thousands of pounds of butter, and whether that does not have an effect on the whole situation.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. HESELTON. I yield gladly. I want to make it entirely clear that I know the respect and admiration the Members of this House have for the gentleman and I share that high opinion of him. In offering the amendment, I intended no reflection whatever upon the excellent work he has done. Rather, it was and is my opinion that the Corporation forced the committee to make a difficult decision because of its failure to present sufficient facts to arrive at a satisfactory figure. I believed yesterday and believe now that we could insure a full disclosure before the committee in the other body by adopting this slightly reduced amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. The basic law states what they shall do and what they shall not do. It is governed by the basic law which has to be changed before their activities can be changed. But I call attention to the fact that I hope I did not say anything that reflected on the gentleman in the least. I know how fair he is and how sincerely desirous he is for economy. He ably represents his district and his viewpoint. Too ably, in my opinion, on yesterday.

Mr. HESELTON. I assure the gentleman I had no such understanding of any remark by him. I said the gentleman made an excellent presentation of his side of the case. That is what he always does and his colleagues respect, admire, and trust him because of that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate this comment, but I do want to take occasion to say that I do not yield to the gentleman in my desire for economy, but I think it should be pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation has gotten back almost 96 cents out of every dollar it has handled.

Mr. HESELTON. I have not addressed myself at any time, in the last year and a half that I have been studying this, to the storage of basic commodities. I know very little about that phase of the program. It may be fully justified. I have been addressing myself to this insane and indefensible program of buying up millions of pounds of butter, dried milk, cheese, and dried eggs, and other food that might be consumed by people who need them but cannot afford to buy them.

I think the gentleman supported the bill that was passed last year but did not clear the other body. What I would like to say in conclusion is this: I think the committee did a very commendable

thing in cutting the request down by $1,100,000. I do not see why the House should not be given an opportunity to go a little bit further in the legislative process, and let that Corporation come up to the other body and justify it, if there is any justification. I doubt if there is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I find the gentleman and I in so much accord that I cannot understand how we got into this difference, because, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I hounded the Department of Agriculture to take action or recommend the legislation which he mentioned. I did it repeatedly, year after year. I say now the Republican Congress did not change the law. No Democratic Congress changed the law. The Secretary said, "I have recommended it repeatedly, and the Congress will not do it." I said, "You recommend it every Monday morning and make the newspapers every Wednesday, until the Congress does do something." He followed that suggestion, and we got relief.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has made a great deal of money on the basic commodities, not to mention the value of having these commodities on hand during our time of extreme need in the recent war. The gentleman and I are in thorough accord on the need for economy as we are on this basic commodity program.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman believe this Corporation justified the amount he recommended?

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly do.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman think they would be injured materially if we were to adopt this amendment and let them come up and make a better showing before the other body?

Mr. WHITTEN. When the gentleman says "they" I remind him that it is not the personnel in which I am interested. I think such an amendment would cause the Corporation to lose many times the dollars to be saved by his amendment and cause untold delay in settling these accounts which are with the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. HESELTON. May I say in reply that if this Corporation was doing its best to liquidate this program I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment if I could, but I am convinced that they are not doing it. Only this morning my office was able to obtain the report that was filed for February. If they need these employees so much why do they not take care of their business as any ordinary business concern would. Here it is the middle of April and we cannot find out what they did in February; and we will not be able to find out what they are doing this month until June. It is about time we taught some of these agencies that they had better make an effort to carry out the mandate of the gentleman and his committee and of the Congress. I think this is one opportunity for us to bear down on them and I think we should.

As I stated, the report for the month ending February 28, reached my office this morning. I have made a preliminary analysis of the situation disclosed by that report so far as 10 commodities are concerned. With reference to the quantities and values of these commodities, it shows that there has been a decrease of 3,061,441,497 pounds, and of $231,870,716.75 from June 30, 1950, to February 28, 1951. I am including these figures under the permission granted in the House, first, to have them available in the record of this debate and, second, to make it easier for all of us to follow the course which may be taken by the Commodity Credit Corporation with reference to the alleged intention of disposing of these commodities during the next few months. The tabulation is as follows:

Inventory

	Dollars		Pounds	
	June 30, 1950	Feb. 28, 1951	June 30, 1950	Feb. 28, 1951
Butter	99,452,285.29	13,512,927.08	161,649,213	21,551,045
Cheese	19,706,623.64	2,998,799.96	58,902,053	8,613,331
Milk, dried	45,718,460.06	18,409,891.81	362,931,819	139,879,604
Eggs, dried	103,290,365.96	73,614,416.45	93,918,525	73,842,769
Peanuts, shelled	None	1,362,471.38		8,877,824
Rice	3,019,321.12	2,654,763.91	68,996,200	28,988,200
Beans, dry edible	79,689,881.33	62,980,217.83	968,710,200	764,254,200
Grain sorghum	104,699,277.02	49,160,146.91	4,127,422,400	1,773,958,500
Peas, dry edible	3,191,320.56	2,256,405.16	91,225,900	55,332,000
Soybeans	163,271.79	10,049.53	3,181,020	198,360
Total	458,930,806.77	226,960,090.02	5,936,937,330	2,875,495,833

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that gets me about this is that with all the talk about it we do not get a statement of the number of employees presently involved and the number that will be involved in the $800,000 that the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes to cut from the bill. I am wondering if the gentleman from Mississippi would give us some information of that kind so that we might have the full picture. Eighteen million three hundred thousand dollars is a lot of money and it ought to hire a lot of people.

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to let between 1,000 and 1,300 people go immediately. There is plenty of defense work to be done; I am not crying for those employees for there is plenty for them to do in the Government right now in defense work; but the thing is that the workload is there and the work has got to be done. If we do not do it now when it should be cleared up it will have to be done later and we will have to carry additional employees through next year where they will be on for an entire fiscal year. I am making no plea for these employees, because there is plenty of work in the Government under these defense agencies for them; but the workload is there and, frankly, they could take this 1,000 or 1,300 people and use them on the work to be done. Not only will it result in losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation many times the amount of money involved here, or at least there will be the chance of that, but it will make them spend more money for personnel during the next fiscal year, because this work has got to be finished. All I can tell you is that this is the result of exhaustive work and exhaustive hearings, and I do not yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts in my efforts to bear down on these departments. I think the printed hearings of the committee show that to be the case.

Mr. TABER. The $18,300,000 that they would have available if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts stays in the bill would still leave them at least 4,500 employees. It seems to me that that is a great number of employees for that organization to have to look after what business it has. I should like a little elaboration on that so that the membership might have an idea of just what kind of picture they are facing.

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that that amount of money which he has mentioned was the amount available from the first of July last for the fiscal year; and, further, as I tried to point out, for some months now they have been operating under a deficiency, which is prohibited except in cases where protection of life or property is involved. In this instance with a corporation that has on its hands $2,000,000,000 worth of Government property the Bureau of the Budget allowed them to proceed, notwithstanding our prohibition against deficiencies.

So they have been operating under a deficiency. In view of that if you make an unreasonable cut here you are leaving the situation where you risk Government property and you are not going to save money.

Mr. TABER. So that we may have a little better picture of this thing, I have in front of me the green sheets that were submitted. In 1951 there were carried funds for the employment of 2,017 in the Department and 3,721 outside. I was low on the figures I gave in my re-

cent estimate. In other words, they had available to them 5,700 employees with the original $16,000,000 that was provided. It seems to me that is an awful lot of employees and that such a collection of employees ought to be able to do the business properly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes because I think we ought to have some idea of what this is about under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman said that on a certain date there were 3,700.

Mr. TABER. That is just in the field. In the Department there were 2,000 besides that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that we certainly have been trying to do the same thing. As of February 28 the number of employees had been reduced to 3,055. We have tried to cut this down in every way we could and we had hoped there would be some premium for the committee trying to hold these things down. The adoption of the amendment yesterday rather indicates otherwise. I still say you will make a costly mistake moneywise so far as this amendment is concerned. I do not differ with the gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the question, but we have gone through the hearings and we are in a little better position to judge what it will cost and what it will save.

Mr. TABER. The problem is that we have figures given in the green sheets that were furnished by the budget. Now, according to those green sheets, the number of employees in the field was 4,200, the number in the Department was 2,017. That is the total number provided for under the original appropriation. If you give them $2,000,000 more, that makes over 6,500 employees. Just how they are in trouble operating that set-up with 6,000 employees is kind of difficult for an ordinary fellow to understand and figure out. I want to see the Congress be fair with them, but it just does not make sense when they request such a number. That is the way it looks to me.

Mr. WHITTEN. I agree with the gentleman, except I insist that the number is half of what he has stated. It is 3,055 as of February 28.

Mr. TABER. Why then do the green sheets that the budget submitted to us indicate that the funds already provided, without this additional amount, would let them have this 6,500? That is what I cannot understand. There must be something the matter somewhere, either with the budget or with the Commodity Credit Corporation and the information it gives to the committee. I think that agency needs a pretty thorough overhauling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate unduly, but I do not want the impression to go out either that everyone who might speak on this subject on this side of the aisle is in favor of this amendment that was adopted yesterday.

With respect to the number of employees of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I was told over the phone just a few moments ago that it is approximately 3,500, and that this cut, coming at the time it does, would mean that they would have to reduce the number by somewhere between 1,000 and 1,300; in other words, while this cut, if made last July at the beginning of the fiscal year, would have been only a 5-percent cut on the total appropriation, coming now when the fiscal year is almost up it means a 30-percent cut in the amount of funds that will be available for the remainder of the year, and it means a 30-percent cut in the number of employees. This comes at a time which is naturally one of the busiest seasons in the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because it comes when the Corporation is taking over commodities that have been under the loan program.

I appreciate the great contribution that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has made during the past year or two in bringing to light some things that should have been uncovered in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think he has done a grand job. I have been happy to work with him on occasion. He is the original sponsor, of course, of the bill that the House passed last year which provided for a more sensible method of distributing perishable commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Ordinarily I would be very much inclined to go along with the gentleman from Massachusetts on a matter of this kind, but I believe that if you will read the RECORD of yesterday and read the statement which he made then in support of his amendment and will compare it with the information which has been made available today, you will have to agree with me that the gentleman from Massachusetts did not make his usual, careful study of the situation before he offered this amendment.

I submit that under the facts that have been made available on the subject this morning, that we will be making a very great mistake and one which will cost the Government of the United States many times the amount of this small saving if we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There is nothing so costly as false economy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, while we are really talking about the Commodity Credit Corporation and the distribution of perishable commodities, I think the RECORD should show that the Congress is to blame for any situation that exists. We pass the laws that the Department of Agriculture must carry out, and I think we should assume our own responsibility. We compelled, by law, the Department of Agriculture to make certain purchases, support prices, and we then told them that they could not dispose of them except under very, very limited conditions. Then the inevitable result had to follow, like the willful destruction of potatoes. Naturally the people could not understand that; I could not, but still a majority of this Congress are the ones who did that. I see the gentleman from the potato State [Mr. FELLOWS] is apparently disturbed at something I said. I will yield to him in a moment. But I worked very hard, as did the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], to try to create some situation where we could have distribution without destruction.

I yield now to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman spoke of the potatoes in Maine.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just picked it out of the air, because it is an interesting subject.

Mr. FELLOWS. These potatoes do not come wholly out of the air. However, this is what I want to call to the gentleman's attention. As they destroy these potatoes, perhaps some 15,000,000 bushels, under our program of so-called reciprocity Canada ships in 15,000,000 bushels. The result is that we support their price as we have been supporting ours. That is what we call the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The gentleman calls that cause and effect, does he?

Mr. FELLOWS. I call that this administration's splendid theory.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman justify the payment of the support price for potatoes, and then destroying them?

Mr. FELLOWS. Certainly not.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's State got the benefit of it.

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not know about the State getting the benefit of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. They certainly got a lot of money up there.

Mr. FELLOWS. Here we are buying industrial alcohol from France, when they could convert these potatoes into industrial alcohol. But having supported the French beet industry, they want to buy alcohol from France.

Mr. McCORMACK. Other countries do not buy anything from us, do they? I understand my friend's views very well.

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not believe the gentleman does understand them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's knowledge in that respect is very limited.

Mr. FELLOWS. But my knowledge is limited only in that respect. The gentleman seems to have trouble around the entire perimeter.

Mr. McCORMACK. If there was one commodity there was no justification for giving a support price to, it is potatoes. There is no question about that. However, I simply referred to potatoes as an illustration of what the Congress did.

There is one other subject to which I want to refer, and that is the subject of speculation, gambling, on the commodity exchanges. The President of the United States last year made a recommendation that the Government during this emergency be given the power and the authority to control gambling in food on the commodity exchanges of the coun-

try. The Committee on Banking and Currency reported out a provision in the National Production Act, that is, the bill as reported out of committee, giving that power. A motion was made on the floor of the House to strike out that provision, and it was carried.

The Commodity Credit Corporation in a report of 6 or 7 weeks ago showed that since Korea, since June 25, 1950, the increase in gambling in food on the commodity exchanges of the country has been tremendous. The responsibility for the inability of our Government to control that gambling rests upon a majority of the Congress of the United States, particularly in this body, who voted to strike that provision out of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I want to ask the gentleman whether the President's recommendation for control of speculation in the commodity exchanges included control of his personal physician at that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a rather cheap observation, and consistent with what the gentleman—I am sorry, because I have too much respect for the gentleman. I will not say that. I think, on reflection, the gentleman would not want that to stand in the RECORD.

When you get to talking about a man's physician or anything else, and tie that up to what I am talking about, I think the gentleman is too fair-minded to do that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not for anything that I consider to be small and beneath the dignity of the House, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman wanted to place responsibility on the Members of the House for failure to control the country generally, and certainly their control over the country is no greater than the President's control over that man who is a prime example of the lack of any kind of control.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say to the gentleman is that I made some remarks yesterday with reference to a brief statement made by another gentleman. I said yesterday that I think it is low and contemptible to make personal attacks on anyone, particularly the President of the United States.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, representation has been made that there are only 3,500 employees here. On examination of the record of the supplemental budget on pages 173 and 174, the record shows there are 2,017 employees in the Department and 4,200 employees in the field.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

ANNUITIES, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WIDOWS

For payment of annuities as authorized by the act of August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465), $204,500.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be appropriate, in view of the discussion which has just taken place regarding the number of employees in one agency, to call attention to the increase in employment generally in Government. When this budget request came from the President, that is through the Bureau of the Budget, to the Committee on Appropriations, and thus to the Congress, it contained a request for $20,000,000 for the decentralization, so-called, of Government agencies. That, I think, very properly was sent by the subcommittee to the legislative committee for action. But this is what I want to call to your attention, Mr. Chairman. Decentralization is not the only method at hand to meet that sort of problem, and yet it seems to be the only method known to the agencies of Government. Many of the agencies of Government today are still working on a 40-hour week. We are talking about $20,000,000—a request for $20,000,000 in the budget to move only 19,000 people. In the hearings before you, or which will shortly be before you, there will be evidence that there would be no hope of moving 19,000 people. There is a possible hope of moving half that number; or on the basis of the experience of one agency recently, of moving 40 percent of those people. Thus we are talking about moving 8,000 people for $20,000,000, leaving the other 11,000 people here to take employment in other agencies and adding 11,000 people at the locations to which the agencies would be moved.

I suggest further that if there are, in defense employment alone, in the city of Washington, 80,490 people, and if they would increase their week's work, they would be able to absorb the entire amount of work without any additional employment, and thus obviate the need of space.

The number of Government employees in February was 2,307,904. The number in the Defense Department, exclusive of people in uniform, and excluding AEC and TVA and NACA, was 1,099,678 employees, which is a tremendous number.

So my suggestion is that before we consider spending $20,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to move 8,000 people, in order to make that much space in Washington, we consider first working a 44-hour week in time of emergency, or even 48 hours a week if this is war.

Second, that we consider, in some of the most critical agencies, working two shifts a day; third, that we consider a very definite increase in the procedural efficiency of the agencies.

I will give you an illustration of what can be done. The General Accounting Office has been applying that policy to their own procedures, and in 5 years has reduced the number of employees in that one agency from 14,904 to 7,063, a reduction of 7,841 without loss of efficiency.

Finally, when we do consider moving, that we move with some discretion, moving entire agencies out of Washington to leave them permanently out of Washington where they can be as well and permanently located in other parts of the country. Then and then only should we come to the question of whether or not we should disperse temporarily because of a war emergency.

Mr. Chairman, the situation is much more serious than I think the Members of Congress generally realize. The Justice Department in 5 years, in the administration of the present President only—and I have taken that because it covers the present emergency—we have increased the Justice Department 9,033 employees, or 37 percent. We have increased the National Labor Relations Board 64 percent, or from 884 to 1,466 employees. We have increased the Civil Service Commission from 3,656 to 4,570, an increase of 29 percent. We have increased the Commerce Department by 10,082 employees in 5 years, or 26 percent. The Federal Security, 6,204, or 12 percent. The State Department, 2,765 employees, or 11 percent. The Post Office Department, 5 percent, or 20,967 employees, all in the 5 years of the administration of the present President. This is the real problem, not whether we shall spend $20,000,000 to move 8,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

For working capital for the "Vessel operations revolving fund," which is hereby created for the purpose of carrying out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Commerce, including charter, operation, maintenance, repair, reconditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I might ask a question of some member of the committee concerning the item of $20,000,000 for working capital for the "Vessel operations revolving fund." I am informed that this fund has reached a sufficiently low level that there are now not sufficient funds for the repair of vessels that should be put in operation, coming out of the laid-up fleet. In at least one instance an operator has agreed to advance the repair costs, with an agreement on the part of the Maritime Administration that it will be reimbursed.

My question is, If such repairs are made and completed before this bill becomes law, would the Maritime Administration be authorized to use a part of this fund to reimburse such an operator?

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I propounded that exact question to Admiral Cochrane, now Administrator of the Maritime Commis-

sion, and he stated that the language in the bill is in there for that purpose, exactly to do that job.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite the matter and save time, I ask unanimous consent that all on page 14, beginning with line 4, through pages 14, 15, and 16, be considered as one paragraph, for the simple reason that it is all interrelated matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TABER. May we have that request repeated?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all of the language on page 14 starting with line 4 through line 24 on page 16 be considered en bloc.

Mr. TABER. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The balance of the matter referred to follows:)

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for shipping services rendered under said fund shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and the fund shall be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities conducted thereunder: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) and 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be applicable in connection with such operations and to seamen employed through general agents as employees of the United States, who may be employed in accordance with customary commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwithstanding the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the employment of persons by the United States: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 percent of vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this fund to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as stated therein: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any working funds or of allocation accounts established, subsequent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore and hereafter received from such activities, may be transferred to and consolidated with this fund, which shall be available for the purposes of such working funds or allocation accounts.

No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine makes a point of order against the paragraphs just read. The gentleman from Maine will state his point of order against the paragraphs just read. The gentleman from Maine will state his point of order.

Mr. HALE. The point of order is that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and it is a very complicated and elaborate piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Maine be specific and point out the exact words?

Mr. THOMAS. I wonder if the gentleman from Maine will restate his point of order citing us page number and line number.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, my point of order lies to that paragraph beginning on page 14, line 12 and the succeeding paragraph down to the end of page 16. They are full of legislation. I admit that there may be some language in the two paragraphs that is not legislation, but it seems to me that legislation is so intertwined with appropriations that it is almost impossible to separate them. I think the gentleman must admit that when the bill says that the provisions of public law so and so, as amended, shall be applicable to such and such operations, it is clearly legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. I wonder if the gentleman from Maine will be good enough to withhold his point of order. I say frankly to the gentleman from Maine that if he insists on his point of order, the committee is ready to admit that it is good. But this is language requested by the Maritime Commission itself. They say it will serve a very useful purpose, and I am advised that without this it would really be a subsidy for the Club Thirteen in that they are seeking to put upon the Government the least profitable business while they maintain the profitable business. I just say that to point out to the gentleman what is involved. If the gentleman wants to strike it out on a point of order we must admit that the point of order is good, because it does constitute legislation, but it is legislation submitted by the Maritime Commission itself which was considered point by point by the committee.

Mr. HALE. My point is that if we are to legislate at the instance of the Maritime Administration—and I do not think the Maritime Commission is necessarily right—then we ought to legislate in a more considered and deliberate way than we can in an appropriation bill.

I am frank to say that I do not understand what the effect of these legislative provisions will be. The effect might be salutary but it does not seem to me that an appropriation bill is the way to get at the problem. I am perfectly willing to do anything that is in the interest of orderly procedure to straighten this questions out. I am not trying to be technical.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from California, myself, and the other members of the committee will attempt to answer any question the gentleman wants to ask about it. We think we have some knowledge on this matter and if we cannot answer the gentleman's question we will be frank with him and tell we do not know.

Mr. HALE. I will be glad to sit down with the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California with a view to working out the matter, but I do not want the RECORD to show that the point of order is waived, if the point of order can be withheld in some way.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the point of order of the gentleman from Maine be held in suspense for a designated period and that the reading of the bill continue until a conference can be held so that we may indicate why the language is in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may reserve a point of order if he so desires.

Mr. PHILLIPS. My inquiry is, Would the gentleman lose his right under the point of order if the reading of the bill continued in the interval? I ask unanimous consent that he do not lose that right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this section will be passed over and returned to when we finish.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I object to that at this time. May I ask the gentleman from Maine against what provisions exactly in the bill does his point of order lie?

Mr. HALE. I made the point of order to the two paragraphs which begin on page 14, line 12, through to the end of page 16.

Mr. HART. Against all of the remainder of the section?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. HART. May I ask the gentleman from Texas with specific reference to the words on page 15, line 16, "or any other"?

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the words "or any other" are merely a catch-all

limitation that if funds are subsequently appropriated or now in existence by which they can be spent for this purpose——

Mr. HART. I would like to invite the gentleman's attention also to the words "any other law" page 16, line 20, then I would like to ask the gentleman whether those specific phrases to which I have referred constitute language approved by the Federal Maritime Board?

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that every word of this language was written by the Federal Maritime Board, submitted to the committee and adopted by the committee.

Mr. HART. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HALE. That legislation would normally come before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. If the whole of the language from line 14, page 14, to the end of page 16 is passed over, it would all be considered en bloc and be open to points of order and amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent.

Mr. TABER. If the unanimous-consent request is agreed to,

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

NIAGARA POWER DEVELOPMENT

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until expended, $450,000.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order to the language appearing on page 17, lines 9 to 18, inclusive, as an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member of the committee wish to be heard?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I shall quote from Cannon's Precedents.

Section 1142 reads as follows:

A treaty providing for mutual reports by contracting nations to an international bureau was held to sanction appropriations for the bureau's maintenance although no treaty had been entered into providing for establishment of the bureau.

Section 1138 reads:

A treaty establishing an international institute authorizes an appropriation in a general appropriation bill for sending delegates to the institute.

In the specific treaty I quote from article 7:

The United States of America and Canada shall each designate a representative who, acting jointly, shall ascertain and determine the amounts of water available for the purposes of this treaty, and shall record the same, and shall also record the amounts of water used for power diversions.

In order for these representatives of the two governments to carry on and to ascertain the possibilities of the use of this water it is necessary to have a preliminary survey. It does not seem possible to effect a division of the waters without such a survey. It deals with the topographical condition and the strata of the earth in the vicinity, the rock formations, changes in hydraulics, and such, and for that reason I feel that this is within the scope of consideration at this time, and the point of order should not lie.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has quoted from the treaty, article 7. May I suggest to the Chairman that when that matter was presented to the Senate for ratification and the Senate ratified the treaty, it did so with the following reservation which the gentleman from Michigan did not read. I quote the reservation. It goes on to say:

That whereas the Senate of the United States of America by their resolution of August 9, 1950, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, did advise and consent to the ratification of the said treaty with the following reservation:

"The United States on its part expressly reserves the right to provide by act of Congress for redevelopment, for the public use and benefit, of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River made available by the provisions of the treaty, and no project for redevelopment of the United States share of such waters shall be undertaken until it be specifically authorized by act of Congress."

Subsequently that was ratified and accepted by Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman press his point of order?

Mr. FENTON. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The point of order has been made that the item appearing on page 17, lines 9 to 18, inclusive, for Niagara power development is not authorized by law. It will be noted that the language of the proposed appropriation provides for investigations pending authorizations for construction of projects for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River allocated to the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

The Chair has examined a copy of the treaty and finds that the treaty provides in some detail for distribution of the water which flows over the Niagara Falls between the United States and Canada and then in article 7 provides:

The United States of America and Canada shall each designate a representative, who, acting jointly, shall ascertain and determine the amounts of water available for the purposes of this treaty, and shall record the same, and shall also record the amounts of water for power diversions.

It has long been settled that a duly ratified treaty to which the United States is party constitutes authority of law for appropriations. And it has also been settled by decisions of the Chair that the treaty need not specifically authorize specific appropriations. It is necessary only that the proposed appropriations be directly necessary to enable the United States to carry out the obligations it has assumed under the treaty. For example, in volume 7 of Cannon's Precedents, section 1138, a decision is recorded holding that where the United States has entered into a treaty establishing an international institute it is in order to appropriate the necessary funds to send delegates to the institute. It was further held in section 1142, volume 7, Cannon's Precedents, that a treaty providing for mutual reports by contracting parties to an international bureau was held to sanction appropriations for the bureau's maintenance although no treaty had been entered into providing for the establishment of the bureau itself.

It seems clear, therefore, that the proposed appropriation is entirely within the purview of the treaty, as its only purpose is to provide the necessary funds for the United States to pay the expenses of the duly authorized representative of the United States acting under article 7 of the treaty.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Will the Chair permit me to make a little observation in that connection?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Under that provision under which the treaty authorizes action to be taken, on page 5 in this bill we have provided for $36,500 for the operations of this treaty within the range of the treaty. This power proposition is an entirely different thing, and beyond it. It seems to me we are going far afield in connection with the operation of a treaty and going into something that has never heretofore been allowed. I just wish to have that in front of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will refer to line 11 on page 17 he will find that it reads:

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization—

The Chair has ruled.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that we have already in this very same bill done just exactly as the Chair indicated when he overruled my point of order. On page 5 of the present bill, under Department of State, the Chair will find we allow $36,500 for the very purposes the Chair has indicated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this ruling of the Chairman is very important. My inquiry is whether the Chairman, in making the ruling which he has, has intended to take cognizance of the reservation made by the other body in its ratification of the treaty.

In other words, as I view it, the precedents to which the Chairman has referred have to do only with cases where a treaty has been ratified, which we all recognize becomes the law of the land. None of them apply to the case where the other body in its ratification of the treaty has made an express reservation of the right to provide by act of Congress for redevelopment or anything else.

In other words, none of the cases referred to by the Chairman are parallel to the situation here presented since there is no similar language by the other body when the ratification of the treaty takes place. My inquiry, therefore, is, because this is I feel an important precedent, whether the Chairman intends, in making this ruling, to include in his decision a consideration of the language employed by the other body in its ratification of the treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. In the brief time that the Chair has had to study this matter, the Chair has made a ruling on the question and the rule stands.

So far as the reservation is concerned, it relates to construction of developmental works and, since the language included in the bill relating only to preliminary investigations could not under any circumstance be considered as authorizing construction, the Chair most hold that the reservation does not affect the situation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 17, line 18, after "$450,000", strike out the period and substitute a comma therefor, and insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation Flood control, general."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The purpose of this amendment is twofold. First of all it would reestablish what was a unanimous decision of the subcommittee which held hearings, and secondly, it would reaffirm that decision by providing that this money should be derived by transfer from flood control, general, instead of through new funds. That was the way it was requested by the Corps of Engineers when the request was brought to us. They did not ask for any new money. They asked to have it by transfer. The subcommittee approved of that. Then on Friday, the full committee, after some discussion but without any record vote, decided to make it new money instead. Frankly, I was not in attendance at the meeting when that was done. Perhaps some may think it comes with poor grace from one who was not there to then attack what appeared to be the majority viewpoint of the full committee. But where you do have first of all a matter of spending new money or transferring it from old money involved, and where you do have a unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee involved, I do believe it is proper for me to raise that issue here on the floor.

I think it should be made clear there are two parts to this Niagara project as included in the bill before us. One of them is remedial and I think in that respect there is no question but that that could be done under the treaty.

I think, on the other hand, there is a very definite question, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, as to whether this survey for power development can be done without the specific authorization of the Congress. But since that issue has been decided, and we are not entitled to further discuss that today, the issue now becomes: Shall we take it out of previously authorized money, as was requested, and as the subcommittee said unanimously that it should be done, or should it be taken out of a new appropriation?

I think it should be made clear also that this is not a door-opening proposition. First of all, the report says that "it is to be understood by the Corps of Engineers that the approval of this item does not commit the Congress to the approval of subsequent requests for appropriations for plans, surveys, or construction of this project."

That was put in in view of the fact that in the request for the fiscal year 1952, now before the subcommittee, there is $2,000,000 for furtherance of this project. The gentleman from Michigan who was in charge of the hearings the day they were held, and held very fairly, agreed with the members of the subcommittee that we would wait and see what happened as a result of this $450,000 appropriation after they had gone out and looked over the drilling and so on before we took any further action on it. So I think perhaps that makes this a completely justifiable project that would not commit us to the spending of huge sums of money in the future, which is always the danger in initial appropriations of this kind.

The reason, as I understand it, why the full committee decided to take it from new money was because of some concern over the fact that existing flood-control projects would be curtailed if this money were transferred. That is not the case. Under the Thomas-Taber amendment, section 1214 of last year's appropriation act, the President was directed to cut down $550,000,000. He did more than that. Part of that excess over the amount he was ordered to cut by the Congress came in this particular field of flood control generally. So at the present time there is an amount of frozen funds in excess of what the Congress ordered the President to do. It is from that money that would now be released under this legislation that this project in the Niagara River would be initiated, but it would not affect any single or identifiable flood-control project now in existence or in progress throughout any part of the United States.

I think those of you who feel they are going to take the money from projects already appropriated for, and going to open the door to huge expenditures in the future, can rest assured that that is not the case and that the subcommittee did examine that construction quite carefully at the time of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, and that I be recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I object. I am a member of the committee and I would like to speak for 5 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. I modify the request, Mr. Chairman, to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is six of one and a half-dozen of another.

In the first place, in the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill last year there were amendments by the House and amendments by the Senate under consideration to make the final cut. I was chairman of the central committee, and we finally agreed on a compromise. That compromise cut was that the Bureau of the Budget be directed to cut at least $550,000,000 from the bill. When the Bureau of the Budget finally got through with its work it concluded with a cut of some $580,000,000. The language "at least" in the amendment gave flexibility to the fund between $550,000,000 and $580,000,000 to the Bureau of the Budget. It was from this flexible fund that they sought to take this money. We tried so to explain it to the full Committee on Appropriations, but the Committee on Appropriations finally made a decision that we would not disturb that fund and that they would give new money for the project. I do not think there was one dissenting vote. They just accepted the idea of the change.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has confessed himself that he was not there. So it is a matter of his opinion on this as against the full committee. I am willing to admit with the gentleman that I favored this as it was originally brought in by the Corps of Engineers, but when there was objection before the full committee they thought it would be better to place new funds, and leave frozen the same amount of money in the Bureau of the Budget, I agreed. So, as I said in the beginning, it is six of one and a half-dozen of another. It does not make any difference to me what way it is done, but the full committee decided to appropriate new funds.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Michigan and I appreciate the very fair way in which this matter and other matters we have had in our subcommittee have been handled by him, but I cannot quite agree with the gentleman when he

says that it is my opinion against the whole committee. Actually what my amendment does is to attempt to substantiate the unanimous opinion of the Army engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the subcommittee which held the hearings on the item.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows that the Army engineers present the proposition, but Congress decides the manner in which it is to be handled, and the subcommittee did decide to go along their way. But the subcommittee is only one of the children of the full Committee on Appropriations, and when the full Committee on Appropriations decides to do it another way I agreed.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain such a request, because time has been limited on this amendment.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, you will find from the House report that under this title there is the only plus sign before the figures in the right-hand column of the subcommittee report. Except for changes made by the full Committee on Appropriations on this paragraph there would have been no plus signs. I do not know what designation we would have used, but at least we would not have increased the funds.

Here is what happened in the full committee. It was a rather confusing parliamentary situation, and I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] will agree that it was. Some discussion did come up in the full committee as to whether or not the allowance of this transfer item would have taken away funds from any flood-control project or planning. The members of the subcommittee tried to point out that in actuality it would not hurt any flood-control project or planning. Apparently we were not successful, and an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] which finally prevailed. That amendment resulted in the increase as shown on page 1 of the committee report. At the same time an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] to strike the entire paragraph from the bill. Actually I was not entirely clear as to what the parliamentary situation was in the full committee, and as a result I asked the chairman of the full committee to clarify it. While this confusing parliamentary situation prevailed we had two quick votes. I am not condemning anybody but I do say that the situation was completely confusing. There was approval given to the Whitten amendment, but I wish to correct the gentleman from Michigan, there were some votes in opposition to the Whitten amendment. I voted against it myself because I did not want to go on record as increasing any item in this bill. It was a voice vote and perhaps in the confusion one could not hear what was being done. I emphasize, however, there were some votes in opposition to the Whitten amendment. I repeat I voted against it myself.

I intend to support the Davis amendment and if the Davis amendment does not prevail I intend to support any amendment which will strike this paragraph from the bill. We of the subcommittee felt that this transfer of $450,000 could honestly be approved. As a transfer item, it would not increase the appropriations, and it would not in any way harm flood control projects or planning. I cannot support an increase in appropriations so will support an effort to strike the paragraph if the Davis amendment fails.

At the time we on the subcommittee got the justifications in the first instance I immediately wondered whether there would not be a sound point of order against this item. It so happens that I served on the Committee on Public Works during the Eighty-first Congress. In the Eighty-first Congress legislation was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and in the other body by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] authorizing the Niagara River power development. Hearings were held but no action was taken on the legislation. Now we come to this point in the consideration of the present bill and find we may appropriate $450,000 for a project that is not yet authorized by law.

With due deference to the Chair and the recent ruling, I do not think it can be justified. I think the paragraph should have been stricken on the point of order. However, I will go along with it as long as it is a transfer item and not a new appropriation. I am very much in favor of the Davis amendment which returns this paragraph to the form in which it was submitted to us by the President and submitted to us by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Davis amendment is the language which was approved by our subcommittee. I sincerely hope we will return to the language which met the approval initially of those I have mentioned, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], myself, and the other Members who were sitting on that subcommittee. As I indicated before it was submitted to us in that form by the President and by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. As I said in my remarks, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other. The only reason I am speaking for it and the manner in which it is presented to the House is on instructions from the full committee. That is the position I find myself in.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Michigan, because of the action of the full committee, is put into a position not of his own making.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 64, noes 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.), including purchase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; $1,750,000: *Provided*, That $110,000 shall be available for providing civil defense communications systems pursuant to subsection (c) of section 201 of said act.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that everyone in the House wants to achieve economy, and we are here for that purpose, but I am amazed at the way we are trying to achieve economy at the expense of civil defense. I think we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish in this instance, because we are gambling, for the sake of a few dollars, with the lives and the production facilities of our whole war economy. It must be obvious to anyone who has studied the problem of national security that unless our home front and its war-production facilities are adequately guarded by civil defense we can lose a war overnight, despite what our military services may be able to do in retaliation against an enemy.

On January 2 we passed the Civil Defense Act, which provided as a policy that—

> The Federal Government shall provide necessary coordination and guidance; shall be responsible for the operations of the Federal Civil Defense Administration as set forth in this act; and shall provide necessary assistance as hereinafter authorized.

The role of civil defense is to prepare the civil population so that it can endure and resist all forms of hostile attack without confusion and loss of morale, and carry on the industrial war effort of the Nation without serious impairment. If these objectives are obtained, no opponent can win a decisive victory by a direct assault against the civilian population alone. On the other hand, if civil defense fails, the chances for the Nation to survive a full-scale assault is doubtful.

Now, I would like to point out in the appropriation that our committee is recommending what a terrific cut has been made in our civil defense activities. The Civil Defense Authority came before the Committee on Appropriations and requested a program for fire-fighting service of $6,840,000 to match State funds of a like amount. That was to procure fire-fighting equipment, hose, and other things to put a fire out in case an area was hit by bomb attack. Our committee appropriated exactly nothing for this contingency. Under warden service, civil

defense requested 200,000 hand extinguishers at a sum of $2,733,000. Our committee has appropriated exactly nothing for that contingency. For engineering service, to provide for water pipe and chemical plants to operate in stricken areas after a bomb attack, in order to provide pure emergency water, civil defense requested $11,330,000, and the committee appropriated exactly nothing. For conversion of 20,000 trucks and vehicles into emergency ambulances, a request was made for $1,500,000, and the committee appropriated exactly nothing. On rescue service, to clear people from debris and fallen buildings and to dynamite wrecked buildings after a bomb attack, the request was for $500,000, and we have appropriated exactly nothing.

We need warning and communication systems, to intercept air attacks or submarine attacks that may come upon our country. While we have a radar screen set up by the Air Force, we need some sort of relay system to transmit the warnings to attack areas so they can prepare for a bombing raid. The military is not equipped to perform this service. It is strictly civilian defense. Adequate warning can save millions of lives.

A request was made for $5,788,000 for this purpose. Yet the committee reports an unworkable sum of $110,000. You can imagine what you can set up in the way of a national air-raid alarm system for $110,000. This is extravagance; not economy.

Another appalling lack of foresight or understanding is for medical services such as organizational equipment, stockpiling of essential materials, and operating costs. A request was made for some $75,638,000. Our committee has appropriated exactly nothing.

On welfare service, providing cots and blankets for stricken people in areas that are bombed, a request was made for $15,426,000, and exactly nothing was appropriated by the committee.

For training and education, $787,000 was asked for and surprisingly enough $890,000 was appropriated. That is fine, but what good are trained volunteers if they have no medical supplies, no fire-fighting equipment, no ambulances, and no water supply?

For research and development to improve medication and communication equipment, a request was made for $3,875,000. Again, not a cent was provided.

We come down to shelters and protective facilities. The civil-defense authorities have admitted that bomb shelters are not a very practical means of providing for civil defense. In fact civil-defense authorities testified that that item should be cut down. Yet this is the largest single appropriation, save one.

We come down to the procurement fund, a revolving fund in order to buy supplies to furnish to the States, who later repay the Federal organization. Twenty-five million dollars was asked for and $5,000,000 was actually granted.

But the pay-off comes in the emergency fund. Mind you, the committee has refused to appropriate anything for fire-fighting service, for warden service, for engineering service, for transportation service, or for a warning and communications system, except for $110,000. But the committee created an emergency fund for postwar attack. Once we are down on our knees, without medical supplies, without ambulances and fire-fighting equipment, without any tools for reconstruction we then have an emergency fund of $100,000,000.

I do not know what a stricken area is going to do with the money by that time, unless you use the greenbacks as bandages. Then it is too late to set up a protective system or to do anything worth while about taking care of these stricken people or reducing the chaos or confusion that comes from an atomic attack.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very plain and forceful presentation he is making at this time. The gentleman is exactly right. We should do nothing to curtail these funds that are appropriated for civil defense. Anyone that has visited the bombed cities of Europe and Japan, incidentally, will know the terrific havoc that war causes and will know that in the last analysis you have to depend upon the civilian population. In order to take care of the civilian population, you cannot depend upon the military, because they are busy doing something else.

I want to point out a couple of sentences on page 36 of the committee report. One is:

> At the present time there exists a wholly adequate and efficient civilian attack warning system in the Air Force, and the committee can see no need for the civil defense personnel to take over this work.

That just simply is not true. We do not have an adequate civil defense warning system in the Air Force. It is totally inadequate, and anyone who has studied it knows it. In the following paragraph it says:

> The committee recommends that an effective radar system be set up.

You can set up a radar system, but the radar system cannot be effective because planes can come in at low altitudes and will not show up on the radar screens. Therefore, the gentleman is making a very important speech at this time, and I commend him for it and hope the committee will listen very carefully to his further remarks.

Mr. McKINNON. I thank the gentleman. I might add that all the coast cities are very susceptible to atomic attack by submarine. There is no defense against that. It is up to us to begin to give some thought and make some preparation as to what we are going to do in defense, not only of our lives but also in furtherance of the war effort which cannot be prosecuted if an atomic attack destroys the morale and productive facilities of our country.

In this committee report, on page 36 the committee has pointed out that it has not seen fit to grant civilian defense any great amount of money for the simple reason that the plan is nebulous in nature, and that, besides, the money will not be spent in 1951, and therefore should not be appropriated in 1951. Anyone knows that the money we are authorizing on the war effort, the $42,000,000,000 providing for bombers and tanks and many other weapons of war, is not going to be spent in 1951. We all understand that thoroughly, and yet we wisely vote the funds to strengthen the war effort as fast as our factories can turn out the weapons. But instead of recognizing the similarity between military effort and civilian defense, the committee hid its head in the sand and says that because we cannot get everything done in civil defense by the end of this calendar year, then nothing should be done. This is nonsense of the first order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question.

It has been my understanding that Federal funds would be available on a 50–50 basis to match State appropriations for civil defense in certain categories, particularly for the stockpiling of medical supplies, fire-fighting equipment, and other such items.

During the month of February, it is my understanding that the Connecticut General Assembly appropriated $300,000 for emergency medical supplies. It did so on the assumption that an additional $300,000 would be available from the Federal Government on a matching basis.

This proper action by the State government was taken in order to safeguard the lives and homes of the people and to protect against possible damage the Connecticut defense industries from which such vital contribution to the defense effort is properly expected.

I rise to ask this question, If the State of Connecticut, subsequent to the enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act obligated this $300,000 prior to the enactment of a Federal appropriation for this purpose, would the additional $300,000 be made available from Federal funds?

If not, I hope proper legislative action may be taken so that those States which were quick to recognize and act promptly in the interest of civil defense will not be discriminated against.

Mr. WHITTEN. This matter has been taken up with the Civil Defense Administration. Their reply in part is as follows:

> Various arguments have been presented to justify or decline applications for contributions for the purpose of reimbursing the States for past expenditures. The act does not specifically authorize such reimbursement, although it refers to "programs or projects approved by the Administrator" which seems to imply that the programs or projects look to future activities rather than to past expenditures. The General Accounting Office has ruled in at least one other situation that financial contributions cannot be made to cover expenditures or obligations

incurred prior to the date funds are appropriated for the particular purpose. (Comptroller General Decision No. A-71315, February 23, 1936.) However, this precedent is not controlling and the legislative history of the act is not conclusive on the point.

In justification of the retroactive financial contributions it can be said that since the act is silent on the point, there can be no prohibition against such contributions and the Administrator is free to act. Further, the refusal to approve penalizes the more alert and progressive States and will generally discourage civil defense activities. It has been said that previous advice to the States to prepare for civil defense implied, at least, a willingness to aid the States financially for civil defense expenditures. Such advice has been issued to the States from time to time since the Hopley report issued in October 1948 by the Department of Defense.

It is our view now that contributions should not be authorized by the Administrator for the purpose of reimbursing States on a retroactive basis for civil defense expenditures for the following reasons:

(1) One of the strong presumptions in our jurisprudence is that statutes operate prospectively only. The presumption is not conclusive, but statutes will not be construed as operating retroactively unless such construction is required by clear, strong, and imperative language or by necessary implication. Indeed, such language as there is looks the other way. The Administrator is to make no contributions except on the basis of plans and programs approved by him, and in order to assure compliance with his plans and programs he may impose such reasonable conditions as he chooses upon the making of contributions. Where an expenditure is already made it is obvious that, unless it fits 100 percent into the Administrator's plans and programs, nothing can be done to make it do so.

Now, that seems to be the opinion of the Civil Defense Administrator.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In view of that answer, I hope that proper legislative action can be taken so that those States which were quick to recognize and to act promptly in the interest of civil defense will not be unnecessarily penalized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we are here asked for a $1,750,000 hand-out to the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Part of the money could be used for so-called meetings, extravaganzas such as the one planned at the Statler Hotel, in Washington, on May 7 and 8, as announced by Administrator Caldwell on April 5, whereby about 1,000 civil-defense officials and governors are being called in for pep talks, reportedly to include one by President Truman.

It might interest the Members to know that while this agency is asking us for automobiles and money for so-called meetings to beat the civil-defense drums that same agency recently played a most unsavory part in practically strangling the civil-defense program of Waterloo, Iowa.

Perhaps Waterloo is not the only victim of the propaganda and lip service indulged in by the Federal Civil Defense Administration. If the experience of Waterloo is typical, we had better delete the additional civil-defense appropriation in this bill and proceed to order the liquidation of the agency.

The sell-out of the Waterloo program is detailed in the following letter that I wrote to Administrator Caldwell on April 7, and to which I have had no written reply thus far:

APRIL 7, 1951.

Mr. MILLARD F. CALDWELL, Jr.,
Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CALDWELL: In view of a recent run-around accorded the city of Waterloo, Iowa, in which your agency played a part, I read with interest and amazement a statement attributed to you by the Washington Evening Star of April 5, 1951.

According to that newspaper, you asserted, in announcing a meeting of more than 1,000 civil-defense directors and governors to be held at the Statler Hotel in Washington on May 7 and 8:

"The most immediate enemy of the American public is apathy toward its own danger."

A recitation of the following facts will demonstrate, I believe, that you placed the shoe on the wrong foot; that certain mobilization agencies in the National Capital, including your own, are guilty of apathy instead of the American public, at least as far as Waterloo is concerned.

That city, one of the largest in the Midwest in terms of industrial production, went to the considerable trouble, in good faith, to raise $35,000 to put into effect a civil-defense program to protect its citizens and factories, including those engaged in defense production, and placed orders for the necessary equipment. In addition, private industry in Waterloo is providing and paying the expenses of more than 100 individuals to be trained by the city fire department to handle the equipment. Here is one civil-defense program that is not costing the Federal Government a single dime.

A main factor in any civil-defense program is, of course, fire-fighting apparatus, but apparently that obvious fact is not known to the mobilizers in Washington, D. C.

On January 15, 1951, the city of Waterloo placed an order with the Construction Machinery Co., Waterloo, for 10 trailer-mounted fire pumpers, single stage, model M-4 centrifugal fire pumps, powered with electric starting 6-cylinder Chrysler, model ind-7 engine, capacity 500 gallons per minute at 120 pounds.

The above-named company, however, was unable to complete the order due to a lack of necessary materials. A priority was needed.

Therefore, on March 14, 1951, Lawrence A. Touchae, mayor of Waterloo, addressed a letter to the Industry Operations Bureau of the National Production Authority requesting the priority, and sent me a carbon copy of his communication which I received on March 16.

I immediately wrote to Horace B. McCoy, chief of the Industry Operations Bureau, urging him to expedite the mayor's request.

Almost daily thereafter, beginning on March 19, my office telephoned Mr. McCoy's office in an effort to ascertain what was being done with respect to Mayor Touchae's request. For days, however, the Bureau was unable even to locate either the mayor's letter or my letter, as I so informed Mr. Touchae on March 21.

Finally, on March 28, when I was in Iowa during the brief Easter recess of Congress, a Mrs. Armour in Mr. McCoy's office telephoned my assistant, Carl Roth, that the NPA Machinery Division was, that day, issuing the priority and asserted the mayor could be notified to that effect. It was stated that due to processing procedure, several days would elapse before the priority would be in the mayor's hands for transmittal to the company.

More daily telephone calls were made by my office to follow the so-called processing procedure from one office and bureau to another.

At last, on April 5, Mr. Roth was advised by James W. Anderson of the NPA Machinery Division that Mayor Touchae's request had been denied following a meeting of the minds of NPA and the Federal Civil Defense Administration which you command; that your agency reportedly wouldn't recommend a priority and so NPA turned it down, notifying Mayor Touchae by letter on April 3 or 4.

Thus, in the space of a week, my office was informed first, that the priority had been granted, and then that it had been denied.

More telephone calls resulted. A Mr. Odom, assistant to the head of the Fire Equipment Division of your agency, asserted that NPA had asked your agency to make the final decision, but that your agency did not do so, believing it was NPA's responsibility.

A Mrs. Lawrence, in Mr. McCoy's office, admitted that a grievous error was made in notifying my assistant in the first place that the priority was being issued.

From the various conversations I was left with the impression that there is no fixed policy with regard to priorities for equipment of this nature; that the subject is only under study.

Strangely, it was suggested that Mayor Touchae appeal his case, making it stronger, although nobody would make any promises that it would do any good. In my opinion, Mr. Touchae has already stated his case adequately, even to the extent of providing affidavits of approval from Mr. Rodney Q. Selby, Iowa Civil Defense Director, and Mr. George Heath, Civil Defense Director for Black Hawk County, in which Waterloo is located.

Judging from your statement reported in the Star, you and others are beating the drums for civil defense louder than ever, calling in 1,000 or more citizens from all over the country for pep talks, reportedly to include one from President Truman.

But in view of Waterloo's experience, the logical question is, What's this civil defense business all about? It is a crying need as stated?

Do we need it or not? If so, why don't you permit States and municipalities to obtain the necessary equipment?

If civil defense is nothing more than propaganda and lip service, as handed Waterloo, why don't you frankly say so? This would enable Waterloo and other communities to save time, effort, and money in conjuring up a civil-defense program, and would make the proposed meeting at the Statler an unnecessary expense along with the continued operation of your agency and others supposedly connected with civil defense.

Who's apathetic?

Very truly yours,

H. R. GROSS.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the time has come to stop the fumbling and bungling that has been all too apparent in the agencies that have been established to protect the welfare of the people. If the National Production Authority and Federal Civil Defense Administration are so snarled in red tape that they cannot function it is time the people who pay the bills be so advised. There is nothing to prevent the heads of these agencies from uttering a public outcry if they are not being permitted to function properly.

If there is maladministration the public ought to know about that, too, and now.

There can be no ignoring of the facts as I have recited them in the letter I have just read that on one hand the Government is screaming for civil-defense programs and on the other hand denying priorities, at least in the case of Waterloo, Iowa, which would make such a program possible.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, such of the statement just made as amounts to an attack on Millard Caldwell can best be answered by simply ignoring it.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I placed in the RECORD a statement as to exactly what the action of the Appropriation Committee would mean to the civil defense program of this country. I am rather reluctant to disagree with a great committee such as the Committee on Appropriations; I have great respect for it and usually for the last 13 or more years I have followed their views after they have studied the problem and brought it to the floor of the House. But I believe today we have got to think about this thing in a more serious tone than we are thinking about it. I did not ask for the job of working out this civil defense program which I brought to the floor in December of 1950, and which passed this House with but one dissenting vote. We first began considering it in the Atomic Energy Committee because of information we have which cannot be brought to the floor of the House. Those of us who attended the committee meeting this morning are concerned.

The action that we are about to take today, in my opinion, will give us no civil defense program for this country. I am sure no one doubts the abiilty of Millard Caldwell and his able assistant, Mr. Wadsworth. I do not think two more able men could have been picked to administer this program. Those of us who have served with Millard Caldwell in this House know his integrity, know his ability, and know about his ability to do a job; also we are well acquainted with Mr. Wadsworth, son of a gentleman who served in this House with distinction for years, a man for whom I have high esteem.

Now, I do not come from a critical target area, so it does not involve me as it does you people in the cities of Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and other parts of the country. You are in critical target areas. If you want to take a chance, all right, good and well. I will not. I brought the legislation here, I brought it in good faith, and the House adopted it; so I think it is incumbent upon this body to see that Mr. Caldwell is not completely hamstrung in his effort to carry out a necessary civil defense program in this country. In the proviso which the gentleman preceding me spoke about, involving $100,000,000, we, after careful study, wrote a legislative proposal. We realized the danger in this legislation. We studied it for 2 years and we put in all of the restrictions in the writing of a piece of legislation that we possibly could to protect this country as we protect our own interests so that it would not be something that the people would laugh at like they did during the last war.

Section 301 is a trigger provision in the legislation and it cannot be put into operation until the bombs are dropped. It is practically marshal law, and that is what you would have to have if you receive a bombing in this country. The proviso in this measure which gives them $100,000,000 will not permit the administrator to touch a cent of it until the bombing is started. That is not good legislation. I am not going to offer an amendment because I do not like to offer amendments to appropriation bills. But I hope the committee will study this proviso. Of course, it will delay the program, the action we are taking today will delay the program regardless of what we do or say; so I am pointing out, I am warning the people who come from critical target areas to think this over in connection with the action you are taking today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take up the time of the House, but I feel I have studied this problem and I am trying to report to the House the knowledge we have gained. I am not sure that the Kremlin is going to start an all-out war, nobody is sure of that, but it is a possibility. We know they have atomic weapons. They have also the conventional weapons. This is not something to scare anybody, it exists today whether you like it or whether you do not like it, and I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not say something in the nature of a warning. If you do not want a civil-defense program, all right, let us junk it, let us get rid of it, but if we are going to have one let us put something back of it and do a decent job.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am from one of these target areas the gentleman speaks of. I would like to know if the delay to which the gentleman refers is fatal? I would like some assessment of the proposition from the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like to make a statement on that with the knowledge I have and with the knowledge that the committee members of the Atomic Energy Committee have, but I will just refrain from doing it. I do not want to scare the country. I do not feel that is necessary, but I do want them to be prepared when and if this thing comes.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman feels he has performed his function when he warns us that we should give this early attention?

Mr. DURHAM. That is what I am doing today.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, who preceded him on the floor, in which he criticised the Administrator of the civil-defense program for warning the country of a danger. Does not the gentleman agree that complacency is rapidly becoming a national evil, that if there is a public enemy No. 1 in the country today it is complacency?

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman very much.

The status of the State civil-defense appropriation legislation, money which has already been appropriated this year, is $128,000,000 or more, that is, the States have taken this action, and made and pending legislative proposals is $202,243,255. The States are acting, and I think it is incumbent on us to take some action that would assure them of a program that they can carry out.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there are two countries who are very realistic in their approach to this problem: One of them is Great Britain and the other is the Soviet Union.

Mr. DURHAM. They never have abandoned the program since World War II.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriation Committee's report on the third deficiency bill disallows $345,000 for the control of the Engelmann spruce bark beetle epidemic in Colorado. The Committee also states that no further work should be done on this project.

Discontinuance of this project will mean that practically all of the spruce timber in Colorado, Wyoming and New Mexico will be exposed to destruction from this extremely virulent insect epidemic. Already about 4,000,000,000 board feet of spruce timber has been killed in western Colorado which is the largest loss of timber from a single continuous insect epidemic experienced in the United States. There are 16,000,000,000 more feet of timber in the national forests and the Rocky Mountain

National Park which now lie in the path of this gigantic outbreak.

The ultimate cost of controlling this huge outbreak is unavoidably large, but failure to control it will result in the greatest timber disaster that this country has ever experienced. It will turn 2,000,000 acres of Colorado's finest green forests into grey ghost forests. These lands are the most important watershed areas in the drainages of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Platte Rivers. Maintenance of stable soil conditions on the steep slopes of the Rocky Mountains and storage of the snow pack for vital irrigation and power will be jeopardized and in the Colorado Rocky Mountains are one of the Nation's greatest scenic and recreational assets. The green clad timber slopes of these mountains are an essential part of their inspirational beauty and attractiveness. If these green slopes are permitted to be turned into great expanses of dead and fallen timber, it will be a serious blow to the State's recreation industry which is a vital part of its economy.

Perhaps the judgment of the committee was unduly influenced by the relatively lower value of the Colorado spruce forests for lumber. It is true that in comparison with Pacific Coast States and the inland empire there has been relatively little cutting in the Colorado spruce forests. However, this timber is one of the important reserves remaining in the United States and is bound to play an important role in supplying the Nation's needs for forest products as depletion through cutting occurs elsewhere in the West. Already arrangements are virtually completed for the construction of a pulp mill in western Colorado which will provide a major market for this timber. However, this pulp mill cannot be maintained permanently unless the spruce bark beetle project is controlled.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement fund," which is hereby established for the purpose of financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of materials or organizational equipment for which financial contributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made on a matching basis by subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $5,000,000. Said fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said materials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance, or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who serves on the Atomic Energy Commission for his interest in civil defense, and the fine work he has done on it. I certainly do not want to criticize in any way the committee, because I know they have a job to do on appropriations, but I just cannot help from taking the floor at this time and expressing my concern about this question of a civil-defense program. We realize that a civil-defense program has got to depend on two things, that is, civilian participation and Federal participation. I agree with the committee in the report that a great deal of this has to be done at the grass roots by civilians. We have to absolutely depend on civilians to form the corps that is going to be necessary to operate any kind of a civil-defense program. They found that out in England and France during the last war when the bombers hit; that the military could not do the job. Therefore we have to depend on civilians and they in turn have to depend on the Federal Government for certain things which they cannot do in their individual communities. Among those things are hospital mobilization between communities, and the furnishing of blood substitutes on a national scale. A great deal of research has been done and is being done on this particular point. Especially will they have to depend on stockpiles of medical aid material. I just recently studied this problem, and it might surprise you to know that in most drug stores of the Nation a citizen today that wanted to go in and buy a civilian emergency medical-aid kit cannot find them in the drug stores. Many of the things that are necessary for civilian emergency medical aid in case of fire or bombing or any other type of damage due to war are not available.

That means that the Government is obligated to encourage the production of these emergency medical aids, and it is going to have to stockpile them in the proper fashion in the communities where they are not now available, these strategic areas.

There is a great field where the Federal Government has to function if we are really going to have national civil defense. I want to point out that we have appropriated $42,500,000,000 for military defense. I believe this request for $403,000,000 is a very modest request. It is less than 4 percent. When total war comes it does not come just to the military forces. Our great industrial centers are the targets that will be hit first.

Now I wish to yield to the gentleman from California so that he can complete the point that he was just about to bring out when his time expired.

Mr. McKINNON. I thank the gentleman.

The thing I wanted to bring out is simply this: The Civil Defense Authority asked for $403,000,000. There was allocated $186,000,000. Of this $186,000,000, $100,000,000 is set aside as an emergency fund to be used after the attack hits, leaving only $86,000,000 to prepare a program, of which $75,000,000 is earmarked for questionable shelter construction. This is totally inadequate, and because it is can be extremely costly.

The committee stated that it did not feel it was necessary to appropriate this money because it could not be spent this year, but now is the time for us to begin thinking about this thing and making our contract authorizations if we are going to have a defense organization that can do the job when the attack comes.

The committee further stated that the report was nebulous. Anyone who knows Mr. Caldwell knows he is a good organizer and will build a compact organization. It takes a little while to get started. I also wish to point out the contradiction between the committee report and the committee testimony. The report says the testimony was nebulous, yet Chairman CANNON said at the conclusion of Mr. Caldwell's statement:

> We appreciate your statement, Governor. We are very glad we have this matter in such competent hands.

He goes on to state further:

> We are very well satisfied with the statement you have given us. You have made a very excellent presentation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his evaluation of Mr. Caldwell. We have had Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth before the Atomic Energy Committee in connection with testimony in regard to these and other matters of importance. I will say that I was very favorably impressed with both Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth. I believe that the civil defense is in capable hands. I have had some experience with the medical department, and I think they have a very fine staff. We have to do our part as the Congress to help these people so that they can go ahead and do a good job.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned

for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the language of the bill on page 23, line 11, after the words "United States" as follows: "or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States."

The language I have read, when coupled with the language in line 18, to which I do not object, makes such person guilty of a fellony, and is legislation in an appropriation bill in that you have a loosely drawn criminal statute inserted in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the gentleman's objection is to the penalties contained therein? Is the gentleman opposed to the section, if I may be permitted to inquire of him?

Mr. YORTY. I am not opposed to the section. I am only opposed to that part which makes a person guilty of a felony who might belong to an organization which merely asserted the right to strike against the Government. I am not opening up the question of the right to strike against the Government. That is another subject entirely. If the gentleman will permit me, I would just like to say that under this loosely drawn criminal statute, which in my humble judgment is unconstitutional, a person might be clear out of the country, a government employee, who is a member of an organization, and if that organization then went on record merely asserting that it had the right to strike, he would, by virtue of that assertion—although he may be opposed to their action—become guilty of a felony. The whole thing just shows in my humble judgment the inadvisability of the Committee on Appropriations endeavoring to write a criminal statute.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that this very provision has been in the appropriation bills for some years now?

Mr. YORTY. I was so informed, yes, sir; but repeating an error or repeating something which is wrong does not make it right.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. In the gentleman's interpretation of that language, does not that set up a blacklist against anybody who ever struck against the Government in the past?

Mr. YORTY. I would not so interpret it as a blacklist.

Mr. BAILEY. If the language is carefully read and considered, it does just that.

Mr. YORTY. It is a criminal statute. A felony is a very serious crime and I think a person should be guilty of it individually and they themselves, at least, ought to assert the right to strike, and not be held guilty of a felony because they happen to belong to an organization which asserted the right.

Some of our large labor organizations, and I think we will all agree that they are legitimate, as a matter of policy do not believe in striking against the Government, but they do assert that they have the right. The Government is going into all kinds of private enterprise and these union members who are engaged as workers in those enterprises will be made, by this criminal statute, guilty of a felony. If you want that kind of a statute it ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary and be carefully drawn. I do not think it ought to be put in in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I might state to the gentleman the reason why this provision has been carried in the bill for some time. I have served on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years now. Many times we do not wish to write legislation, but where there is no other provision taking care of the situation in most instances the appropriate legislative committee is pleased to have it provided in this way, pending the time when they take action. In the instant case if the gentleman presses his point of order, there is nothing we can do but concede that the point of order is well taken. In doing that, may I point out to the gentleman that for the time being at least you are turning this thing loose without any way of your or my knowing when the Committee on the Judiciary will act or can act or how long it will take. Under present conditions, with the Russian situation being what it is, and with what the investigating committees are showing every day, far be it from me to believe that I can lecture the gentleman, but I would like to point out to the gentleman that he is assuming a risk which I think is greater than many people would like to assume, because this would be turning the whole thing loose.

Mr. YORTY. If the gentleman will permit me I will say that so far as fighting communism in the United States is concerned, I yield to no one. I was the first chairman of an official state committee that was ever appointed in the United States to investigate Communists. My first big fight was with the so-called State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, which I said was a Communist organization in 1939, and which the national CIO threw out last year. Therefore, that question is not involved.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say to the gentleman, I have not in the least intimated that the gentleman is in sympathy with these people. In fact his statement now just makes my wonderment a little stronger at his present action. If he presses his point of order, of course we will have to accept it.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been made to the language on page 23, line 11, as follows: "who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States." Does the gentleman press his point of order?

Mr. YORTY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, is the point of order against the one provision, or is the point of order made against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] is against that one provision only.

Mr. CANNON. Then Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard with respect to the point made by the gentleman from Missouri?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished Chairman will permit me, I think he is making a mistake in striking all of the language.

I did not refer to the language that had to do with membership in an organization that would otherthrow the Government, because that is covered in the Smith Act, and is still the law. I was only referring to that part, and raised my point of order only to that part which made a man guilty of a felony for belonging to an organization that merely asserted the right to strike against the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the matter is all in one proposition. If we have to consider it at all we will have to consider it as one proposition. I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. YORTY. I am making my point only against the part of the section which I read. If the gentleman wishes to raise the point against the entire section that is his responsibility, not mine.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DELANEY). The gentleman from Missouri makes a point of order against the section beginning on line 16, page 22, and ending in line 6, page 24, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair must sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1302. This act may be cited as the "Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951."

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the passage of the Davis amendment I was on my feet at that time for the purpose of offering an amendment relating to lines 9 through 18 on page 17, chapter IX of the bill. The Chair did not recognize me. I ask unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill for the purpose of allowing me to offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have passed that part of the bill, and proposal to return at this time must be objected to. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Committee will now return to page 14, line 4, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, may I inquire of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] if he will withdraw his point of order?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed the point of order with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am advised that if the point of order is sustained, it is contended that it will throw out the first paragraph of the section, and possibly upset meritorious plans. I do not wish to be unduly technical, although I very much deplore this approach to a serious legislative problem. However, I think the matter will receive further consideration in another body, and I hope that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will give consideration to the legislative policies involved.

Having those points in mind, I have decided to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the three pages mentioned be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I would like to state that I concur in the action taken by the gentleman from Maine, not only for the reasons that he has stated but on the assurance of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] that the wording of the amendment is the product of Admiral Cochrane, Chairman of the Maritime Administration, in whom I have the greatest confidence.

Mr. THOMAS. I give the gentleman that assurance.

Mr. HART. I hope that in the future the departmental heads will not seek to transfer jurisdiction from one committee to another.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] give the House assurance that his committee will give consideration to this whole problem at an early date?

Mr. HART. I will give that assurance to the House, as well as to the gentleman in person.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Maine, as well as to the gentleman from Texas, with reference to the legislation in this appropriation bill that some of the greatest abuses and scandal in the giving away of the taxpayers' money during World War II grew out of the operations of the War Shipping Administration which was set up by Executive order of the President. And now the President, by Executive order, has set up the same sort of thing by the name of the National Shipping Authority and the legislation in this appropriation bill bypassed the hearings of the legislative committee and sets the stage for the same kind of spending abuses and scandal of the War Shipping Administration on which recoveries have never been made. So unless there is assurance that there is going to be something done in conference that will stop the abuses as to the expenditure of public money like that occurring in World War II, where the War Shipping Administration wasted and gave away hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, I shall have to insist on the point of order. Therefore, I ask the gentleman from Texas with reference to his position as to what will be done in conference to insure against the occurrence of the same abuses and scandal.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sorry, but I did not hear all of the gentleman's question; will he use the microphone?

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman from Texas with reference to legislation that it attempted to be written into this appropriation bill. The greatest abuses, scandal, and wasting of taxpayers' money during World War II grew out of operations of the War Shipping Administration created by Executive order of the President, in which the Chairman of the Maritime Commission and the Chairman of the War Shipping Administration were one and the same person, and now the same vehicle is again created by the President under the name of the National Shipping Authority. The legislative part of this bill provides the same sort of authority and opens the door for the same kind of abuses and scandal.

I want to know whether this is going to be corrected in conference, because I shall make the point of order unless we get assurance that there will not be a repetition of the shipping abuses and scandals that occurred in World War II by the operations of the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission. With reference to the abuses, wasting of money, and scandals as to maritime insurance, operation of ships, chartering of ships, building of ships, the scandals of general agency, chartering, and the scandals of subsidized lines, where the Maritime Commission or War Shipping Administraiton did not take over the ships even when the Government paid one-half of the construction. That all arose from the loose legislation of the type now attempted in this appropriation bill, yet here it is again being sought to give the same authority without hearing on the previous scandals, without correction of the previous abuses, and with no authority of the legislative committee. There has been ample opportunity since June 24, 1950, to have legislation through the proper legislative committees holding hearings thereon as to abuses and scandals of previous operations so that they might be corrected in this new venture of the Maritime Administration and National Shipping Authority.

Yet the head of the Maritime Administration comes in with secret hearings before the Appropriations Committee, and the legislative committee knew nothing of this subterfuge until the hearings of the Appropriations Committee became available to the Members of the House when this bill was called for debate on the floor of the House. Does the gentleman from Texas assure this House that in conference something will be done so that authority for these abuses will not be slipped into the conference report? Because if this will not be done, I shall have to renew the point of order. The matters contained in this appropriation bill are strictly of legislation and should be considered before the Merchant Marine Committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio point out some of the defects. He has served on that very able and distinguished committee for a good many years; he served as its chairman for some years. I want to commend him for the good work that he and his committee have done. But you know this little subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has labored long and hard for some 4 or 5 years in an effort to straighten out the good old Maritime Commission, particularly in view of those fat subsidies they have been paying to the Club 13 and a good many other abuses. The gentleman well knows that they have had a considerable housecleaning in the Maritime Commission. In my humble judgment I doubt if there is a finer administrator in the Government service or that there has been a finer one since I have been here than Vice Adm. Ned Cochran. I think he will do a good job, and I will give the gentleman from Ohio my assurance, and I think the other members of the subcommittee will join me in this statement, that we will watch this fund anl anything that gets out of line we will certainly bring to the gentleman's attention, and we will invite him to sit in with us and help us in every way, because we really need his help. The Maritime Commission does also because it has been doing a rather vast business for the last 20 years. I do not have to tell the gentleman that, do I?

Mr. WEICHEL. The gentleman from Texas has always been most helpful. All I can say is that while there may be a new executive at the top, the same old crowd is down at the bottom. I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, further reading of the section will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very shortly going to introduce a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to report the same

back forthwith deleting lines 9 to 18 on page 17 of the bill. I do so because pursuant to the treaty with Canada for the development of Niagara power it was specifically stated in the treaty that the Federal Government would not expend any money for the development of power until authorized by Congress.

Now, as a matter of fact, I have before this House a bill, which has been referred to the Committee on Public Works, for the development of power in the Niagara River by private enterprise. Very shortly, it is my understanding that the State of New York will introduce a bill, or there will be introduced a bill, for the development of power in the Niagara River in the State of New York. There is presently before the Committee on Public Works of the House a bill introduced by a gentleman of this House for development by the Federal Government of power in the Niagara River.

Mr. Chairman, the $450,000 provided in this particular provision of the pending bill is not for remedial work; it is for the development of power, and it so states, and for the investigation of the possibility of the development of power projects in the Niagara River. That part of the river happens to be in my congressional district, and in my congressional district we still believe there is no substitute for the ingenuity of free men working under a system of free enterprise for the development of power any more than for the manufacture of automobiles. We believe at a time like this, when all of the money in America is needed for defense and defense purposes, there should not be allocated a half million dollars for investigation of power possibilities by the Federal Government through an appropriation bill, but that it should be done after a study by the Committee on Public Works on how best for all the people of America can be developed the power in the Niagara River.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman know that the people in the State of New York in 1949 paid $293,000,000 more for their electricity than they would have had to pay right across the line in Ontario?

Mr. MILLER of New York. That is only because of the fact that the private project within the State of New York paid that much difference in taxes to the Government, and it relieved the taxes on the real estate within my congressional district and the other sections of New York. As a matter of fact, across the river in Canada the power rates would be greater if you consider the fact they did not receive Government subsidies.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, you paid that much more than you would have paid in Tacoma, Wash., where they paid more taxes in proportion than the Power Trust pays in New York.

Mr. MILLER of New York. The facts I have cited do not indicate that is so.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I can cite the gentleman the figures.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know that on the basis of the testimony given to the Committee on Appropriations two-thirds of the water flowing down the Niagara River at the present time is flowing on the Canadian side of the border and that the purpose of this investigation is to determine the best method to get more of the water back to the American side? If the gentleman's contention be correct it will mean that a natural resource is going more and more to the country on the north and that the private power companies for whom he speaks may very well be out of business in a relatively short time.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Does the gentleman know that section within this bill states that the purpose is the development and utilization of power? Does the gentleman also know that private enterprise in the State of New York has made previous studies of this proposition and are ready to go to work and develop the power with private capital without taxpayers' money if they are given the opportunity to do so?

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know that as a result of this study it may very well be that the private power companies may be in a much better position to take advantage of the water resources of the Niagara River?

Mr. MILLER of New York. The old story will prevail, when the Federal Government spends a half million dollars in there they will want to continue.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The testimony before our committee on this project was to the effect that the Mohawk Power Co. was ready, able, and willing to put up every dollar necessary to develop that power if given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. MILLER of New York. That is my understanding and I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of stating that very shortly we will have before us the so-called Heselton amendment. In my opinion, the Heselton amendment is too severe. Instead of the $750,000 cut proposed, a reduction of $300,000 could be made without harm. Let us look at it from a realistic point of view. When this particular amendment goes over to the Senate, and there then follows a conference between the House and the Senate, I believe we will have about the right figure in the bill as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation limitation is concerned.

I personally do not think that any governmental activity is so sacred that it is untouchable as far as economy is concerned. When we realize that the Commodity Credit Corporation is here allotted an additional $2,000,000, making nearly $20,000,000 available for administrative expenses, certainly a saving of 3 percent of that large sum could be effected without in any sense harming its operations. I have too often fought for Commodity Credit on this floor to be willing to see anything done to hurt it or prevent it from continuing to do a splendid job. Nevertheless, we must save a little here and there, even at the expense of activities we favor most. For that reason, knowing that this proposed cut will not harm Commodity Credit, and also knowing that it is our duty here to hold down expenses as far as is consistent with good operation, I intend to vote "aye" on the Heselton amendment.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for any person to justify the federalization of electric power or any other segment of our free enterprise system upon its own merits; therefore the electric power federalizers attempt to use the good name of the meritorious rural electrification cooperatives to enhance their ulterior motives and assist their socialistic scheme.

The rural electrification program was founded and has existed upon a democratic basis, logical principles, and American philosophy. It is not a nationalized program, and has no kinship to federally owned and dominated industry. Oh, yes, some are making desperate efforts to remove controls of these justifiable benefits from the farmers and turn the operations over to the Federal Government. That must not happen. Those who would nationalize the electric industry want it to be generally thought that the successful REA program is federally owned and controlled; and it is a part of their program to nationalize the REA co-ops along with other electric industry.

The REA program is a justifiable necessity. Private enterprise either could not or would not bring electricity to the sparsely settled rural areas of this country. It has proved to be a wondrous improvement to our rural areas.

However, there are a few people in this country who will tell you that there is a Communist behind every bush, and in the very next breath advocate everything that the Communists stand for.

Talk about overcharge for electricity to people of Michigan and New York. If you are describing the savings to electricity consumers upon the basis of how cheap the Government can produce electricity where the Government has no taxes to pay, no accountability to stockholders, and is subsidized for all operational losses, of course the Government can produce electricity cheaper than private enterprise can produce it. But I am at a loss to know where you are going to get the money to operate this Government when you put the taxpaying enterprises out of business as Russia has done. Those hollering here the loudest and longest that Communists are just taking over this country then stand here each and every day in this Congress advocating liberalistic ideas that even Joe Stalin would turn his nose up at.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman think the people of Ontario are Communists?

They are really about the most conservative people in America; and they have one of the finest public power systems in the world. If all the people of this country got their electricity at the Ontario rates they would save more than $2,000,000,000 a year on their light and power bills.

It would take a thousand bales of cotton for every county in Arkansas to pay the overcharges for electricity paid by the people of that State every year.

The figures I am using are correct. They are compiled by the finest experts in America and are thoroughly reliable.

Mr. TACKETT. I do not know what the people of Ontario are, but if I would listen to the gentleman from Mississippi I would think that everybody in this country besides him was a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman know that the people of the State of Arkansas are overcharged 100 percent for their electricity?

The statement of the gentleman from Arkansas to the effect that public power is communistic is about the silliest, if not the most stupid, argument I have ever heard.

The power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It must be handled by a monopoly. Any monopoly of a necessity is a public business. Besides, the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government—as the Supreme Court has decided time and again. If it had not been for our public power program the average farmer in this country would not have seen an electric light in his house for the next 50 years.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman says that the people in Arkansas are overcharged 100 percent, I believe he says, for electricity. In that same pamphlet he has in his hand, which he has been putting in the RECORD for years and years and years, he tells about the overcharge in Tennessee, when there is not one private electric company in Tennessee. Where can he get those figures? Nobody knows. There is not one logical reason or any basic foundation for a single, solitary figure that the gentleman has been putting in the RECORD since I was a child.

While the gentleman from Mississippi daily denounces communism in name he strongly advocates all of the economic principles of communism. To advocate such principles it is necessary to fight communism in order to get along with our people.

Show me one thing that is American about this federalization of power, federalization of all monopolies. All of us frown upon monopolies. There is no question in any of our minds about that. But I would rather see little monopolies controlled by the municipalities, controlled by the States, and controlled by the Federal Government, than to see one great octopus monopoly, Nation-wide in scope, a Federal monopoly controlled by the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Last year before our committee came the chairman of the New York Power Authority. I asked him if he thought he could generate power cheaper than private industry could do it if you relieved private industry of taxes, and his answer was "We could not do it."

Mr. TACKETT. Certainly they could not do it, but it is a saving, so says the gentleman from Mississippi, if you pay one penny more than the Government can produce it at, when they have no taxes to pay and they have no stockholders to account to, and they are subsidized for all losses. That is savings.

Yes, I will assure you that the Government can sell groceries a lot cheaper than private enterprise can sell them. I can assure you that the Government can sell clothing a lot cheaper than private enterprise. But I am telling you good people one thing, you can stand up here and holler for this two-bit welfare idea on the theory as advanced by the gentleman from Mississippi and it will not be long before you are not going to have any democracy left.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, without resolving this question which has arisen here, I would like to call your attention again to the fact that at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill by the committee, and when we are in the House I expect to ask for a vote on the so-called Commodity Credit amendment. In doing that I think we ought to be given an opportunity to correct what I believe to have been a mistake when the committee accepted the amendment yesterday. We have these commodities. We have this volume of business. We have these contracts in excess of 300,000 in grain alone where we have the bookkeeping work and we are trying to arrive at how much storage and how much transportation and how much of everything goes into each contract. On April 30 we will have additional numbers of such things. The work has to be done and these accounts have to be worked out and the settlement gotten to the farmers throughout the Nation. If this cut stands, these settlements are going to be delayed and we are going to risk losing additional money by the Commodity Credit Corporation. You are going to be very busy making explanations to the farmers of the Nation and there is no occasion for it because you do not save money by this amendment. I heard my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, in his statement just now when he said that he hoped to resolve these differences, by accepting this amendment and splitting the difference with the Senate. I would not say you cannot make some explanation for a vote in favor of this cut, but I do say that the explanation is liable to end up being taken as an excuse. It is the same situation as existed with the Commodity Credit Corporation a few years ago when my Republican friends prohibited them from providing warehouses. Many farmers were precluded from coming under the loan program of the Commodity Credit Corporation and they took the explanation as an excuse. This work has to be done and the money has to be provided, and the people, too, so that they can get through with this backlog by July 1, or we will have to carry it over into the new year at additional cost.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows very well that the gentleman from Minnesota does not need any excuses to vote for some economy in Government. After all the gentleman certainly will admit that if we in agriculture want to cut every other division of Government, certainly we ought to get down to some safe and sane point in agriculture as well.

Mr. WHITTEN. I agree with the gentleman. I will say that I am sure he sincerely believes he has a sound explanation of his position. I am afraid others might think it an excuse. I do not believe the gentleman offered an amendment in committee which was not adopted and which amendments were for the purpose of reducing any amount.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall my observation on this point was that $2,500,000 should be sufficient.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Also certainly the other three members of our subcommittee will agree that I reserved in subcommittee every right to do as I see fit on the floor. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

The gentleman is certainly right. There is nobody here whom I hold in higher regard than I do the gentleman. He reserved all rights. He may be right about this, but I think he is wrong. What I am trying to say is that the explanation he offers is liable to be accepted as an excuse instead of an explanation in the minds of the farmers and the people who are going to be affected by this, if he should be wrong in his judgment. The Republican leadership had that so-called explanation on the action of restricting warehousing, but the people thought it was an excuse, and found out, to their minds, at least, it was something to their detriment. I am again telling you you are making the same kind of mistake if you keep this amendment in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Commodity Credit Corporation amendment on page 11.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 23, after the word "to", strike out "$19,100,000" and insert "$18,350,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 250, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—159

Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Bakewell
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Buffett
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Case
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Denny
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dondero
Donovan
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fellows
Fenton
Ford
Fulton
Gamble
Gavin
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gwinn
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Wyo.
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jackson, Calif.
James
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Latham
Lucas
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McVey
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara
Ostertag
Patterson
Phillips
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stefan
Taber
Taylor
Thompson, Mich.
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vaughn
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Weichel
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wolverton
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—250

Aandahl
Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Anfuso
Aspinall
Bailey
Barden
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Bramblett
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Chatham
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cox
Crosser
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Doughton
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fugate
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
George
Gordon
Gore
Gossett
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Gross
Hagen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Hill
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Hunter
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, Hamilton C.
Jones, Woodrow W.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Larcade
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lind
Lovre
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan
McMullen
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Martin, Iowa
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neill
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Redden
Regan
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sasscer
Scrivner
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Tackett
Talle
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Vinson
Walter
Welch
Werdel
Wheeler
Whitaker
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wood, Ga.
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—24

Allen, La.
Armstrong
Boykin
Brehm
Buchanan
Buckley
Celler
Dingell
Dorn
Fine
Frazier
Gillette
Judd
Miller, Md.
Morton
Murray, Wis.
O'Konski
Reams
Rhodes
Secrest
Sieminski
Smith, Va.
Tollefson
Woodruff

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Smith of Virginia against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fine with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. AANDAHL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call I was in the radio gallery recording a broadcast to my district in Minnesota. I did not know of the roll call and therefore was not in the Chamber and regret that I cannot qualify.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER of New York. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman who is opposed to the bill without qualification desire to offer a motion to recommit the bill? If not, I assume the gentleman from New York qualifies by a bare margin.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of New York moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 17, strike out lines 9 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

H. R. 3557

AN ACT

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 11 (legislative day, MARCH 26), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of Revenues of the District of Columbia)

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Office of the Corporation Counsel", $5,000; and the limitation under this head in the

1 District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951 on the
2 amount available for the settlement of claims is increased
3 from "$7,000" to "$12,000".

4 FISCAL SERVICE

5 COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

6 For additional amounts for "Collector's Office", fiscal
7 year 1949, $653,568, and fiscal year 1951, $144,700.

8 COURTS

9 UNITED STATES COURTS

10 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "United
11 States courts", $265,443.

12 PUBLIC WELFARE

13 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

14 For additional amounts for "Saint Elizabeths Hospital",
15 fiscal year 1949, $13,704, and fiscal year 1950, $22,604.

16 SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

17 For an additional amount for the payment of claims
18 in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in ac-
19 cordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11,
20 1929, as amended (46 Stat. 500), $7,493.

21 JUDGMENTS

22 For the payment of final judgments rendered against
23 the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Document
24 Numbered 67 (82d Congress), together with such further
25 sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceed-

ing 4 per centum per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment, $5,580.

AUDITED CLAIMS

For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1948 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in House Document Numbered 67 (82d Congress), $4,648.

CHAPTER II

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", $1,000, to remain available until expended.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For an additional amount, for liquidation of contract authority, for the House and Senate improvements authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940

1 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the Acts of June 8, 1942
2 (56 Stat. 342), July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472), Second
3 Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), and
4 the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, $268,000,
5 of which $168,000 shall be available for the House improve-
6 ments and $100,000 for the Senate improvements.

7 For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings",
8 $3,000.

9 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

10 For an additonal amount for "House office buildings",
11 including furniture and furnishings, $21,500.

12 CHAPTER III

13 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

14 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

15 For an additional amount for "American sections, inter-
16 national commissions", $36,500, which shall be derived by
17 transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to inter-
18 national organizations"; and appropriations granted under
19 this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available to enable
20 the President to perform the obligations of the United States
21 under the treaty between the United States of America and
22 Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the
23 United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "International information and educational activities", for facilities for radio transmission and reception, and so forth, as authorized in the third proviso under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, $9,533,939, to remain available until expended; and the limitation contained in said proviso is increased from "$41,288,000" to "$50,821,939".

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", $30,000.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $6,147,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for the purchase of seven hundred passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided.

1 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

3 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
4 Bureau of Prisons", $125,000.

5 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

6 For an additional amount for "Support of United
7 States prisoners", $139,000.

8 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

9 For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities",
10 $1,380,000, for replacement of the power and heating
11 plants of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia:
12 *Provided,* That the limitation under this head in the Depart-
13 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1951, on the cost of
14 completion of the replacement of a power plant at the
15 United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, is repealed.

16 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

17 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

18 CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

19 For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport
20 Act", $1,464,384, to remain available until June 30, 1953,
21 as follows: Visalia Municipal Airport, Visalia, California,
22 $40,277; Gainesville Municipal Airport, Gainesville, Florida,
23 $9,467; Waycross-Ware County Airport, the city of Way-
24 cross and Ware County, Georgia, $55,417; Harding Field,

1 the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $140,650; New
2 Orleans Airport, Orleans Levee District and the Orleans
3 Airport Commission, Louisiana, $257,237; Laurence G.
4 Hanscom Field, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, $91,-
5 528; English Field, Amarillo, Texas, $29,590; Rio Grande
6 Valley International Airport, Brownsville, Texas, $384,161;
7 Eaker Airfield, Durant, Oklahoma, $359,580; Jefferson
8 County Airport, Jefferson County, Texas, $40,593; and the
9 Draughon-Miller Municipal Airport, Temple, Texas,
10 $55,884: *Provided,* That no request for reimbursement of
11 the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed
12 under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be con-
13 sidered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951,
14 and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress
15 after July 1, 1952 of the actual or estimated cost of such
16 rehabilitation or repair.

17 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

18 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For an additional amount for "Civil Aeronautics Board,
20 salaries and expenses", $25,000.

21 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL

23 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
24 departmental", $450,000.

1 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FIELD

2 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
3 field", $70,000.

4 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

5 TONGASS FOREST HIGHWAYS, ALASKA

6 For surveys, construction, reconstruction, and mainte-
7 nance of Tongass forest highways in Alaska in accordance
8 with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway
9 Act of 1950, $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

10 PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS

11 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the
12 contract authorization granted by section 10 of the Federal-
13 Aid Highway Act of 1950, $750,000, to remain available
14 until expended.

15 THE JUDICIARY

16 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

17 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

18 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Fees
19 of commissioners", $25,000.

20 FEES OF JURORS

21 For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", $200,000.

1 CHAPTER IV

2 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

3 BUREAU OF THE MINT

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
6 $130,000.

7 COAST GUARD

8 OPERATING EXPENSES

9 For an additional amount for "Operating expenses",
10 $1,000,000.

11 ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

12 For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction,
13 and improvements", $350,000, to remain available until
14 expended.

15 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

16 (Out of the postal revenues)

17 POSTAL OPERATIONS

18 For an additional amount for "Postal operations",
19 $7,500,000.

20 TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS

21 For an additional amount for "Transportation of mails",
22 for payment of increased rates to railroad carriers for 1951

1 and prior fiscal years, in accordance with Interstate Com-
2 merce Commission Order of December 4, 1950 (Docket
3 Numbered 9200), $152,000,000.

4 FIELD SERVICE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

5 OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

6 Clerks, First- and Second-Class Post Offices

7 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Clerks,
8 first- and second-class post offices", $150,000, to be derived
9 by transfer from the appropriation "Clerks, third-class post
10 offices, 1947".

11 OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

12 Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service

13 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Rail-
14 road transportation and mail messenger service", $200,000,
15 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Domestic
16 air mail service, 1948".

17 CHAPTER V

18 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

19 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

20 EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND

21 For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation
22 fund", $3,000,000.

1 CHAPTER VI

2 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

3 FOREST SERVICE

4 FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

5 For an additional amount for "Forest development roads
6 and trails", $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

7 COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

8 The limitation under this head in the Department of
9 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount avail-
10 able for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is in-
11 creased from "$16,350,000" to "$18,350,000".

12 CHAPTER VII

13 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

14 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
17 $2,000.

18 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

19 CONSTRUCTION

20 For an additional amount for "Construction", $3,650,-
21 000, to remain available until expended.

1 TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

2 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

3 For an additional amount for "Construction, Alaska
4 Railroad", $4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

5 CHAPTER VIII

6 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

7 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

8 ANNUITIES, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WIDOWS

9 For payment of annuities as authorized by the Act of
10 August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465), $204,500.

11 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

12 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

13 The amount authorized to be transferred from the ap-
14 propriation granted under this head in the Supplemental
15 Appropriation Act, 1951, to the appropriation "Operating
16 expenses", for the reactivation of industrial plants, is increased
17 from "$14,000,000" to "$26,000,000".

18 EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

19 Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal
20 year 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and
21 improvements to public buildings under the control of the
22 General Services Administration.

1 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

2 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

3 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
4 sions", $26,618,000, to remain available until expended.

5 AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR DISABLED
6 VETERANS

7 To enable the Administrator to provide, or assist in pro-
8 viding, automobiles or other conveyances for disabled vet-
9 erans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950
10 (Public Law 798), $800,000.

11 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

12 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

13 MARITIME TRAINING

14 The limitation under the head "Maritime training",
15 United States Maritime Commission, in the Independent
16 Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available
17 for administrative personal services and so forth is increased
18 from "$2,477,000" to "$2,532,000".

19 VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

20 For working capital for the "Vessel Operations Revolv-
21 ing Fund", which is hereby created for the purpose of carry-
22 ing out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Com-

1 merce, including charter, operation, maintenance, repair, re-
2 conditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the
3 jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, $20,000,000, to
4 remain available until expended.

5 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for
6 shipping services rendered under said Fund shall be pre-
7 scribed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Fund shall
8 be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities
9 conducted thereunder: *Provided,* That the provisions of sec
10 tions 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) and 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-
11 eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be appli-
12 cable in connection with such operations and to seamen
13 employed through general agents as employees of the United
14 States, who may be employed in accordance with customary
15 commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwith-
16 standing the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the
17 employment of persons by the United States: *Provided fur-*
18 *ther,* That such sums as may be determined to be necessary
19 by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the
20 Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 per centum of
21 vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this Fund
22 to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes
23 of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating
24 functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as
25 stated therein: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any

1 other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any
2 working funds or of allocation accounts established, subse-
3 quent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for
4 under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore
5 and hereafter received from such activities, may be trans-
6 ferred to and consolidated with this Fund, which shall be
7 available for the purposes of such working funds or allo-
8 cation accounts.

9 No money appropriated by this or any other Act may
10 be used for the payment to the owner on account of the
11 purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States
12 is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United
13 States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United
14 States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated
15 cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent
16 to such sale by the United States: *Provided,* That, in the
17 case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted
18 pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant
19 Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall
20 not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of
21 March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of
22 capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to
23 such date: *Provided further,* That in the case of a bona fide
24 purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed
25 the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such pur-

1 chaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal
2 Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United
3 States is chartered or taken for use by the United States,
4 the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall
5 not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted
6 under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were
7 purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the
8 preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with
9 the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue
10 for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such
11 schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5
12 per centum per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of
13 any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the
14 Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose
15 whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by
16 the United States, except in accordance with the preceding
17 provisions.

18 CHAPTER IX

19 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

20 CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

21 THE PANAMA CANAL

22 CIVIL GOVERNMENT

23 For an additional amount for "Civil government",
24 $72,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
25 "Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal."

1 CORPS OF ENGINEERS

2 NIAGARA POWER DEVELOPMENT

3 For engineering and economic investigations, pending
4 authorization for construction, of projects for development
5 and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the
6 Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the
7 treaty between the United States of America and Canada,
8 signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States
9 Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until ex-
10 pended, $450,000, to be derived by transfer from the ap-
11 propriation "Flood control, general".

12 CHAPTER X

13 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

14 International Children's Welfare Work

15 To enable the President, during the fiscal year 1951, to
16 carry out the provisions of title V of the Foreign Economic
17 Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 209), relating to inter-
18 national children's welfare work, $5,000,000.

19 CHAPTER XI

20 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

21 Expenses of Defense Production

22 For an additional amount for "Expenses of defense
23 production", $33,029,000: *Provided,* That appropriations
24 under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available
25 for rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of

1 Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and
2 improvements necessary for the proper use by the Govern-
3 ment, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30,
4 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a): *Provided further,*
5 That the appropriation to the President for Emergencies
6 (National Defense) shall be reimbursed from funds con-
7 tained herein for allocations made therefrom to any agency
8 of the Government for carrying out the provisions of the
9 Defense Production Act of 1950 after March 31, 1951:
10 *Provided further,* That the aggregate of borrowings from
11 the Treasury pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense
12 Production Act of 1950 which may be outstanding at any
13 one time is increased from "$600,000,000" to "$1,600,-
14 000,000": *Provided further,* That any appropriation to any
15 department, agency, or corporation, in the executive branch
16 of the Government, for salaries and expenses, shall be avail-
17 able for the discharge of responsibilities, relating to the na-
18 tional defense, assigned to such department, agency, or
19 corporation by or pursuant to law: *Provided further,* That
20 the appropriation "Expenses of Defense Production" may
21 be increased by transfer of not to exceed $1,834,000 of
22 funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 to the Depart-
23 ments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and the

1 General Services Administration for the purpose of carrying
2 out the duties and responsibilities assigned to these agencies
3 under provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

4 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

5 FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

6 OPERATIONS

7 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in
8 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act
9 of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including pur-
10 chase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor
11 vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
12 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the
13 Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of em-
14 ployees occupying positions of critical importance from the
15 standpoint of national security; and expenses of attendance
16 at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; $1,750,-
17 000: *Provided,* That $110,000 shall be available for pro-
18 viding civil defense communications systems pursuant to
19 subsection (c) of section 201 of said Act.

20 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

21 For financial contributions to the States pursuant to
22 subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense
23 Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June

1 30, 1952: *Provided,* That of this amount $75,000,000 shall
2 be available only for shelters and other protective facilities:
3 *Provided further,* That the Administrator shall not approve
4 any programs or projects for such shelters and protective
5 facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within
6 the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts
7 to be made available by the States to match contributions
8 hereunder.

9 CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

10 For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement
11 fund", which is hereby established for the purpose of
12 financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of mate-
13 rials or organizational equipment for which financial con-
14 tributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made
15 on a matching basis by subsection (i) of section 201 of
16 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $5,000,000. Said
17 fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said mate-
18 rials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance,
19 or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable
20 appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such
21 materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to
22 any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of
23 materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be
24 in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

1 CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND

2 For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund", $100,000,-
3 000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided,*
4 That said fund shall be available only in the event of a
5 proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as pro-
6 vided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of
7 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress) and shall be ex-
8 pended in accordance with the powers vested in the Presi-
9 dent and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Adminis-
10 tration by title III of said Act.

11 CHAPTER XII

12 CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND
13 JUDGMENTS

14 For payment of claims for damages as settled and deter-
15 mined by departments and agencies in accord with law,
16 audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting
17 Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by
18 United States district courts and the United States Court of
19 Claims, as set forth in House Document Numbered 85,
20 Eighty-second Congress, $1,999,045, together with such
21 amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when
22 specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements
23 of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and
24 such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as

may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further,* That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

CHAPTER XIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1302. This Act may be cited as the "Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives April 10, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

APRIL 11 (legislative day, MARCH 26), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

Please return to
DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
Office of Budget and Finance

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1951 No. 69

Senate

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in knowledge of whom standeth our life: From the tumult of an angry world we seek the sanctuary of Thy presence, not that we may escape from the world, but that we may turn to the perplexing maze of its tragic problems, with strong spirits and quiet minds.

Help us to recognize truth and to welcome revelation from whatever quarter they arise. Strip us of our boastful illusions. Open our eyes to the evils among us that we condemn in others. As the winds blow harder may our roots strike deeper. Whatever outward things these dangerous days take from us, by Thy grace may they make us inwardly more adequate and wise, dependable and strong. May we so guard the treasures of our freedom, bought with a great cost, that we will not allow the fight for freedom to destroy the freedom for which we fight, nor the inner national unity with which we must face the tyrants who seek our destruction. Fit us to faithfully protect the Republic from outward aggression and from inner selfishness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFarland, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 13, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, requested the Senate to return to the House the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, for the purpose of making a correction.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted on its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. Vinson, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Kilday, Mr. Durham, Mr. Short, Mr. Arends, and Mr. Cole of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who died in active service, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—RETURN TO HOUSE OF BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, will be returned to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request.

AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO LT. THOMAS J. HUDNER, JR.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on April 13 the Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded to Lt. (jg) Thomas J. Hudner, Jr., United States Navy, for his bravery in attempting to rescue a fellow naval aviator whose plane had crashed in enemy territory in North Korea.

Lieutenant Hudner is a citizen of Fall River, Mass., and it therefore affords me particular pleasure in asking unanimous consent that the official text of his citation for the Medal of Honor be printed on the first page of the Congressional Record. I know that Members of the Senate will experience great pride in reading this citation. Lieutenant Hudner's action was indeed a magnificent act of courage and bravery which inspires all who know about it. Heroism such as his is the rock on which our Nation's existence rests. Unselfishness such as his symbolizes all that is finest and best in human nature.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to: Lt. (jg) Thomas Jerome Hudner, Jr., United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as a pilot in Fighter Squadron 32, attached to the U. S. S. *Leyte*, while attempting to rescue a squadron mate whose plane, struck down by antiaircraft fire and trailing smoke, was forced down behind enemy lines in the Chosin Reservoir Area of Korea on December 4, 1950. Quickly maneuvering to circle the downed pilot and protect him from enemy troops infesting the area, Lieutenant (jg) Hudner risked his life to save the injured flier who was trapped alive in the burning wreckage. Fully aware of the extreme danger in landing on the rough mountainous terrain, and the scant hope of escape or survival in subzero temperature, he put his plane down skillfully in a deliberate wheels-up landing in the presence of enemy troops. With his bare hands, he packed the fuselage with snow to keep the flames away from the pilot and struggled to pull him free. Unsuccessful in this, he returned to his crashed aircraft and radioed other airborne planes, requesting that a helicopter be dispatched with an ax and fire extinguisher. He then remained on the spot despite the continuing danger from enemy action and, with the assistance of the rescue pilot, renewed a desperate but unavailing battle against time, cold, and flames. Lieutenant (jg) Hudner's exceptionally valiant and selfless devotion to a shipmate sustain and enhance the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendment and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilize-

tion of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act.'"

"(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen or national of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of 18 years and 6 months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be held to be applicable to any alien admitted for a temporary period (other than an alien exempt from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) who has remained in the United States for a period in excess of 1 year; any alien admitted for a temporary period who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States.'

"(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is hereby amended to read: 'The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereafter provided (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this Act.'

"(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: 'No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945.'

"(e) No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.

"(f) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, following his induction, be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than 4 months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this 4 months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone): *Provided*, That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining any person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title in violation of the provisions of this paragraph.'

"(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: '(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of 26 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title.'

"(h) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"'(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"'(3) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"'(4) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of 18, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.

"'(5) Any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardians be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"'(6) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title.'

"(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of 6 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air Nation Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force.'

"(j) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

"(k) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking

Calendar No. 281

82D CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 302

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

APRIL 30 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3587]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House	$473, 165, 368
Amount of decrease by Senate	−43, 062, 891
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	430, 102, 477
Total estimates considered by the Senate (contained in H. Docs. 47, 57, 67, 68, 69, 74, 75, 81, 82, 83, 84, 95, 99, and 109, and S. Docs. 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, and 25	896, 116, 293

Budget estimates considered by the committee total $896,116,293. The House recommended appropriations of $473,165,368. The committee recommends appropriations in the amount of $430,102,477, a decrease of $466,013,816 in the estimates and a decrease of $43,062,891 in the House bill. These amounts are distributed by chapters of the bill in the following table

Chapter	Agency	Budget estimate	House bill	Recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
I	District of Columbia	*$1,172,740*	*$1,122,740*	*$1,122,740*	*−$50,000*	
II	Legislative	1,541,378	293,500	1,553,878	+12,500	+$1,260,378
III	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	114,229,384	23,839,323	23,863,323	−90,366,061	+24,000
IV	Treasury-Post Office	169,080,000	160,980,000	167,480,000	−1,600,000	+6,500,000
V	Labor-Federal Security	53,000,000	3,000,000	53,000,000		+50,000,000
VI	Agriculture	7,521,150	3,000,000	6,145,000	−1,376,150	+3,145,000
VII	Interior	8,503,000	7,652,000	8,502,000	−1,000	+850,000
VIII	Independent offices	72,637,500	47,622,500	47,622,500	−25,015,000	
IX	Civil Functions	Language	Language	Language		
X	Foreign Aid	12,500,000	5,000,000	7,500,000	−5,000,000	+2,500,000
XI	Defense Agencies	454,000,000	219,779,000	111,331,895	−342,668,105	−108,447,105
XII	Claims and Judgments	3,103,881	1,999,045	3,103,881		+1,104,836
	Total	896,116,293	473,165,368	430,102,477	−466,013,816	−43,062,891

Chapter XI

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Expenses of Defense Production

The committee recommends that funds by made available for fourth quarter requirements in the total amount of $38,424,000 for implementation of the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950. This amount is $205,000 below the amount allowed by the House of $38,629,000; is $6,292,378 below the revised requirements submitted to the Senate, and is $12,576,000 below the budget estimate of $51,000,000.

The committee also recommends that the words "by transfer or otherwise" be inserted in the provision authorizing appropriations for salaries and expenses of regular agencies to be available for the discharge of responsibilities relating to the national defense, and that the last proviso, limiting to $1,834,000 the amount of transfers to this appropriation, be deleted. The purpose of these changes in language is to provide the required flexibility for absorption of a larger portion of the funds needed from an adjustment of the regular programs of the agencies concerned.

The funds to be made available are recommended to be derived as follows:

From unobligated balances from third quarter	$5, 795, 129
From absorptions through adjustments of regular programs	5, 296, 976
From appropriation recommended	27, 331, 895
Total of funds available	38, 424, 000

The amount of the appropriation recommended of $27,331,895 is $5,697,105 below the appropriation allowed by the House of $33,-029,000. The $10,000,000 appropriated by H. J. Res. 238 (Public Law 22) would be a charge against the appropriation in this bill.

A lump-sum amount is recommended by the committee to be made available, to be allocated substantially in accordance with the following tabulation. It will be noted that the amounts recommended by the Senate, with one exception, are stated as ceilings for the various activities, totaling $40,424,000, from which anticipated savings of $2,000,000 are deducted in order to provide a total amount available of $38,424,000. In the one exception, the committee was impressed with the need for keeping open the field offices of the Department of Commerce, so critically required by the National Production Authority, and recommends that the indicated ceiling of $2,400,000 be subject to a reduction of not more than 10 percent.

Funds appropriated to the President, expenses of defense production, fourth quarter, 1951

Agency (1)	Budget estimate, fourth quarter (2)	Amount allowed by House (3)	Revised fourth quarter requirements (4)	Allocation ceiling recommended by Senate (5)
Defense Production Administration	$950,000	$950,000	$950,000	$950,000
Department of Commerce	(9,870,000)	(7,550,000)	(10,828,000)	(9,120,000)
National Production Authority	7,124,000	6,500,000	7,639,200	6,500,000
Office of Field Service	2,400,000	1,000,000	2,852,100	[1] 2,400,000
Office of the Secretary	118,000	0	126,200	80,000
Office of International Trade	80,000	0	102,400	50,000
Office of Transportation	94,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Office of Technical Services	18,000	0	20,000	20,000
Industry Evaluation Board	36,000	0	38,100	20,000
Department of the Interior	(1,800,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,657,999)	(1,300,000)
Office of the Secretary	93,860	20,000	93,000	50,000
Defense Solid Fuels Administration	212,526	100,000	183,400	150,000
Defense Electric Power Administration	230,220	100,000	205,250	200,000
Defense Minerals Administration	530,000	500,000	500,000	400,000
Petroleum Administration for Defense	550,000	450,000	550,000	450,000
Defense Fisheries Administration	183,394	30,000	126,349	50,000
Department of Agriculture	(1,485,000)	(500,000)	(1,648,430)	(525,000)
Production and Marketing Administration	1,275,000	500,000	1,468,300	500,000
Forest Service	82,500	0	82,500	25,000
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	40,000	0	30,000	0
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	30,000	0	30,000	0
Legal, informational, and other departmental services	57,500	0	37,630	0
Defense Transport Administration	550,000	550,000	550,000	500,000
Economic Stabilization Agency	(29,000,000)	(23,029,000)	(23,029,000)	(23,029,000)
Office of the Administrator	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Office of Price Stabilization	25,650,000	20,679,000	20,679,000	20,679,000
Wage Stabilization Board	3,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Department of Labor	(730,000)	(250,000)	(584,949)	(400,000)
Office of Defense Manpower	53,000	50,000	53,000	53,000
Office of the Secretary	37,000	0	37,000	37,000
Bureau of Labor Standards	148,000	0	46,778	25,000
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	12,000	0	9,950	9,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship	208,000	200,000	200,813	174,000
Bureau of Employment Security	190,000	0	190,002	90,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics	82,000	0	47,406	12,000
Department of Justice	135,000	0	50,000	50,000
Federal Security Agency	1,068,000	0	670,000	500,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	312,000	0	148,000	50,000
General Services Administration	5,100,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,000,000
Total	51,000,000	38,629,000	44,716,378	40,424,000
Less anticipated savings				2,000,000
				38,424,000
Deduct unobligated balance		3,766,000		5,795,129
		34,863,000		32,628,871
Deduct absorptions		1,834,000		5,296,976
Amount of appropriation		33,029,000		27,331,895

[1] Subject to a reduction of not more than 10 percent.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

The budget estimates for the Federal Civil Defense Administration total $403,000,000. The House recommended an appropriation of $186,750,000. The committee recommends a total appropriation for this activity of $84,000,000.

For the appropriation entitled, "Operations, Federal Civil Defense Administration," the budget estimate is in the amount of $128,000,000 and the House allowed an appropriation of $1,750,000. This appropriation finances among other things the stockpiling of medical serv-

ices, organization equipment, etc. The committee recommends an appropriation of $74,000,000 for this particular item of appropriation. The table following furnishes the details of the amounts recommended by the committee:

Operations, Federal Civil Defense Administration

Program	Estimate	House action	Senate committee recommendation
Fire-fighting services: Organizational equipment	$6,840,000	0	$5,000,000
Warden service: Organizational equipment	2,773,000	0	500,000
Engineering services: Stockpile	11,330,000	0	5,000,000
Transportation services: Stockpile	1,500,000	0	500,000
Rescue service: Organizational equipment	500,000	0	250,000
Warning and communications system:			
Organizational equipment	5,521,000	(1)	3,840,000
Operating costs	237,000	[2] $110,000	160,000
Reserve supply operations: Operating costs	2,058,000	0	250,000
Medical services:			
Organizational equipment	13,850,000	0	10,000,000
Stockpile	61,761,000	0	40,000,000
Operating cost	27,000	0	----------
Welfare service, stockpile	15,426,000	0	7,000,000
Training and education: Operating costs	787,000	[3] 890,000	500,000
Research and development: Operating costs	3,875,000	0	----------
Executive direction: Operating costs	1,515,000	750,000	1,000,000
Total	128,000,000	1,750,000	74,000,000

[1] House allowed $5,000,000 in the appropriation "Federal contributions" for this purpose.
[2] Equipment only.
[3] An increase of $103,000; language in House Report indicates intent to give this to Public Affairs for education of "man on the street."

For the appropriation entitled, "Federal Contributions," the budget estimate is in the amount of $250,000,000 and the budget estimate contemplated the use of these funds for protective facilities. The House recommended an appropriation of $80,000,000 consisting of $75,000,000 for protective facilities and $5,000,000 for communication equipment. The committee recommends that no appropriation be provided for "Federal Contributions."

For the appropriation entitled, "Civil Defense Procurement Fund," the budget estimate is in the amount of $25,000,000 and the House granted an appropriation of $5,000,000. This appropriation as approved by the House establishes a working fund for the purpose of purchasing organizational equipment, the fund to be reimbursed upon delivery of equipment to the States. The committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for this fund, an increase of $5,000,000 over the House bill.

The appropriation of $100,000,000 for a "Civil Defense Emergency Fund" was included in the bill by the House. The funds would be available under the House language only in the event of the proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency. The committee recommends that the funds and the language for this appropriation be stricken from the bill.

Increases and Limitations

The changes recommended by the committee in the amounts of the House bill are as follows:

Chapter II—Legislative Branch

Senate:

Payment to the heirs of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan	$12, 500
Contingent expenses: Furniture and repairs	17, 878
Total, Senate	30, 378

Architect of the Capitol:

Senate restaurants: Coffee shop in Senate Office Building	30, 000

Government Printing Office:

Working capital and congressional printing and binding	1, 200, 000

This amount is necessary to compensate for the cost of the volume of work being handled, the sharp increases in the cost of paper, and increases in labor costs.

Total increase, legislative branch	1, 260, 378

Chapter III—Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary

Department of State:

International Information and Educational Activities:

The House recommended an appropriation of $9,533,939 representing the amount required to meet price and cost increases to complete facilities provided for in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. The budget estimate is in the amount of $97,500,000 and the balance of $87,966,061 was disallowed by the House. The committee is in agreement with the House as to the amount of funds which should be provided in this bill. In view of the urgency in connection with this supplemental bill together with the necessity for securing complete details on such a vast program, the committee has denied the additional funds in this bill. The matter is one which can be considered in detail by the Subcommittee handling Department of State appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year.

Department of Justice:

Federal Prison System:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	324, 000

The House allowed $125,000 of an estimate of $149,000 to provide for increased population. Subsequent to the passage of the bill by the House an additional estimate of $300,000 was submitted to the Senate in Senate Document No. 24. The additional amount requested is required to meet increases in the prices of food, clothing, medical service, and related expenses of the inmate population. The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimates.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Chapter IV—Treasury and Post Office Departments

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT:

Postal operations $7,500,000

The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate of $15,000,000 for Postal Operations, the House having cut the estimate to $7,500,000. The Post Office Department cannot control the volume of mail it is called upon to handle and when patrons post an unusually large amount of mail not anticipated, the Department must be in a position to handle that mail. The amount of funds allowed by the House is entirely too restrictive to permit the service to operate without affecting the quality of service rendered.

Chapter V—Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY:

Office of Education:

Grants for surveys and school construction 50,000,000

The committee recommends the following paragraph be added to the bill:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

GRANTS FOR SURVEYS AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and school construction", to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities: Provided, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under this head, shall also be available to enable the Commissioner to provide school facilities pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815).

(Applications for school construction which have been received and approved, or are eligible for approval, far exceed the amount of funds presently available to provide urgently needed school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities. Additional funds are needed to authorize school construction required as a result of an increase in defense activities to provide for unhoused school children. The Committee therefore recommends the entire amount of the Budget estimate of $50,000,000 submitted in Senate Document No. 23.

(The proposed appropriating language will authorize the Commissioner of Education to give priority to urgently needed school facilities in critical areas to be designated by the President, and in other areas affected by Federal activities. It will also authorize the use of funds presently available for the direct provision of school construction as provided by section 203 and 204 of Public Law 815.)

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Chapter VI—Department of Agriculture

Department of Agriculture:

Control of forest pests, Forest Pest Control Act $345,000

The amount recommended by the committee will be used to combat the spruce bark beetle infestation in timber stand of Engelmann spruce in Colorado. A large quantity of timber has already been killed by this beetle and approximately 16,000,000,000 board feet of Engelmann spruce are threatened by this insect in Colorado alone. It has been demonstrated that the infestation can be successfully combatted at a cost of approximately $2.50 per tree. The committee feels that this valuable timber should be saved and has therefore recommended the amount of $345,000 be made available for this purpose.

Forest Service:

Forest development roads and trails 2,800,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $5,800,000 or an increase of $2,800,000 over the House bill. The amount recommended includes $5,000,000 for additional main-haul timber access roads in the national forests to permit the harvesting of ripe and overripe timber which is presently inaccessible and $800,000 for repair of damage to national forest improvements caused by floods.

Total increase, Department of Agriculture 3,145,000

Chapter VII—Department of the Interior

Department of the Interior:

Bureau of Mines:

Construction 350,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $350,000 to provide funds for modifications and additions to a pilot plant constructed during World War II at Laramie, Wyo., so that research on the production of alumina from low-grade ores may be revived. It is desirable to develop processes for the production of alumina from low-grade raw materials found in abundant quantity in several areas of the United States, so that our dependence upon foreign supplies may be reduced.

Office of Territories:

Construction, Alaska Railroad 500,000

The Committee recommends that the amount in the bill for "Construction, Alaska Railroad" be increased from $4,000,000 to $4,500,000, the budget estimate. This amount is to be used to replace shop facilities recently destroyed by fire and it was the hope of the House committee that by consolidating the structures a saving could be accomplished. However testimony before this committee was to the effect that best railroad practices call for separate buildings to reduce fire hazards. The committee therefore recommends the budget estimate of $4,500,000 in order that separate buildings may be constructed to house the various shops.

Total increase, Department of the Interior 850,000

Increases and Limitations—Continued

Chapter VIII—Independent Offices

Office of the Housing Expediter:

Salaries and expenses:

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the payment of terminal leave is changed from "$2,000,000" to "$1,000,000".

On March 23, 1951, Public Law 8 was approved extending Federal rent control until June 30, 1951. This change in the limitation on the use of funds appropriated to the Office of the Housing Expediter provides an additional $1,000,000 for the administrative expenses necessary to continue rent control operations through June 30, 1951.

Chapter IX—Department of Defense

Civil Functions

Corps of Engineers, Army:

Niagara Power Project:

With respect to the title of this paragraph, the committee recommends the deletion of the words "Niagara Power Development" and the substitution therefor of the words "Niagara Redevelopment Remedial Works Investigation" since it is felt the latter title is more accurate and better reflects the congressional intent with respect to this item.

The House report contained the following statement relating to this paragraph:

> "It is to be understood by the Corps of Engineers that the approval of this item does not commit the Congress to the approval of subsequent requests for appropriations for plans, surveys, or construction for this project."

The committee is in complete agreement with this statement in the House report and reiterates it at this time so that there will be no question of congressional intent.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Chapter X—Funds Appropriated to President

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK..... $2,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,500,000 for contribution to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. Title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 535, approved June 5, 1950) authorized $15,000,000 to be appropriated in fiscal year 1951 for international children's welfare work. On two previous occasions this Committee recommended an appropriation of $12,500,000 to carry out the terms of this authorization and on both occasions the measure was unanimously adopted by the Senate; however, in conference between the two Houses, the Senate yielded to the position of the House to provide no appropriation at that time.

In the pending bill, the House has recommended an appropriation of $5,000,000 with the understanding that the United States contribution shall be not more than 33 percent. The committee is in complete agreement with the recommendation of the House that the contribution of the United States, apart from temporary emergency aid in national catastrophes, should not exceed 33 percent of the total amount contributed by other governments including services and matching funds of recipient countries. Accordingly, it is recommending the above amount to fulfill the United States proportionate obligation for fiscal 1951 on the present ratio.

Chapter XI—Funds Appropriated to the President

INDEPENDENT OFFICES:

Federal Civil Defense Administration:

Operations..... 72,250,000

The House recommended an appropriation of $1,750,000 for Operations. The Senate committee recommends an appropriation of $74,000,000 or an increase of $72,250,000 in the House bill. The committee further recommends that language providing for "security guard services" be included in the language of this paragraph and that the limitation of $110,000 proposed by the House for civil defense communications systems be deleted. A further explanation of the action of the committee with respect to the appropriations for Federal Civil Defense will be found earlier in this report.

Civil Defense Procurement Fund..... 5,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 in the House bill.

Total increase, Independent Offices..... 77,250,000

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Chapter XII—Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments

JUDGMENTS AND AUTHORIZED CLAIMS	$1, 104, 836
Total increases	143, 934, 214

Chapter XIII—General Provisions

GENERAL PROVISIONS—SECTION 1301:

The provision forbidding employment of individuals who are members of organizations which advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence and of organizations which assert the right to strike against the Government has been included in the bill. The provision has been carried in all appropriation bills for many years and was deleted from the House bill on the floor of the House.

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Chapter III—Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE:

Federal Bureau of Investigation:

Salaries and expenses	275, 000

The budget estimate was $6,547,000, of which the House allowed $6,147,000. Inasmuch as the amount allowed by the House will not be available during April the sum of $275,000 can be deducted from the bill without in any way reducing the program of the F. B. I.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE:

Civil Aeronautics Board:

Salaries and expenses	25, 000

At the present time the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is conducting a study looking to the early separation of subsidy payments from compensatory mail payments, and a report will in all likelihood be made by May 1. The Chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee informed this committee that based upon the report a bill will be introduced, and he feels that pending the report referred to no new studies should be initiated as such studies would most likely delay matters.)

Total decrease, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary	300, 000

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Chapter IV—Treasury and Post Office Departments

TREASURY DEPARTMENT:

United States Coast Guard:

Operating expenses $1,000,000

A review of the current status of appropriations for the Coast Guard indicate that obligations for Coast Guard operating expenses are running less than expected, and that no additional funds will be necessary this year in order for the Coast Guard to prepare to take over the ocean weather stations on July 1. The committee therefore recommends the deletion of this item.

Chapter VIII—Independent Offices

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Department of Commerce:

Maritime Activities.

It is recommended by the committee that the following language relating to the purchase or requisition of vessels previously sold by the United States be deleted from the bill.

~~No money appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 per centum per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law,~~

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued

~~neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine for any purpose whatsoever a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.~~

Chapter XI—Funds Appropriated to the President

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT:

Expenses of Defense Production:

The committee recommends an appropriation of $27,331,895 which is a reduction of $5,697,105 under the House bill. A detailed explanation of the committee action will be found earlier in this report..... $5, 697, 105

INDEPENDENT OFFICES:

Federal Civil Defense Administration:

Federal contributions..... 80, 000, 000

The committee recommends that this entire paragraph be deleted from the bill:

~~FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS~~

~~For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.~~

Civil Defense Emergency Fund..... 100, 000, 000

The committee recommends that this entire paragraph be deleted from the bill:

~~CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND~~

~~For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund", $100,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That said fund shall be available only in the event of a proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as provided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress) and shall be expended in accordance with the powers vested in the President and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration by title III of said Act.~~

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Total decrease, chapter XI funds appropriated to the President	$185, 697, 105
Total decreases	186, 997, 105

RECAPITULATION

Total increases	143, 934, 214
Total decreases	186, 997, 105
Net decrease	43, 062, 891
Amount of bill as passed House	473, 165, 368
Net decrease	43, 062, 891
Amount of bill as recommended to Senate	430, 102, 477

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF AMOUNTS OF THE BUDGET ESTIMATES AND OF THE AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED TO BE APPROPRIATED BY THIS BILL

District of Columbia (Out of District Revenues, Not Included in Tabulation of Totals)

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
67	Office of Corporation Counsel	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000		
67	Collectors Office, 1949	653,568	653,568	653,568		
67	Collectors Office, 1951	144,700	144,700	144,700		
67	United States Courts, 1950	265,443	265,443	265,443		
	Public Welfare					
47	Day Care Centers	50,000			−$50,000	
67	St. Elizabeths Hospital, 1949	13,704	13,704	13,704		
67	St. Elizabeths Hospital, 1950	22,604	22,604	22,604		
	Total, Public Welfare	86,308	36,308	36,308	−50,000	
67	Claims and Suits	7,493	7,493	7,493		
67	Judgments	5,580	5,580	5,580		
67	Audited Claims	4,648	4,648	4,648		
	Total, District of Columbia (ch. I)	1,172,740	1,122,740	1,122,740	−50,000	

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with— Budget estimates	House bill
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
	SENATE					
	Payment to the heirs of the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenburg			$12,500	+$12,500	+$12,500
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES					
82	Furniture	$17,878		17,878		+17,878
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE					
75 and 109	Stationery (revolving fund)	1,000	$1,000	1,000		
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS					
	Capitol Buildings:					
82	House and Senate Improvements (roof and and Chamber)	268,000	268,000	268,000		
82	Capitol Buildings	3,000	3,000	3,000		
99	House Office Buildings	21,500	21,500	21,500		
S. 22	Senate restaurant	30,000		30,000		+30,000
	Total, Architect of the Capitol	322,500	292,500	322,500		+30,000

S. 17	Government Printing Office: Working capital and congressional printing	1, 200, 000		1, 200, 000		+1, 200, 000
	Total, Legislative Branch (ch. II)	1, 541, 378	293, 500	1, 553, 878	+12, 500	+1, 260, 378
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
67	American sections, International Commissions	(1)	(1)	(1)		
74	International information and educational activities	97, 500, 000	9, 533, 939	9, 533, 939	−87, 966, 061	
	Total, Department of State	97, 500, 000	9, 533, 939	9, 533, 939	−87, 966, 061	
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
67	Department of State Building, New York, N. Y.	1, 470, 000			−1, 470, 000	
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
67	Legal activities and general administration: Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	160, 000	30, 000	30, 000	−130, 000	
67	Federal Bureau of Investigation, salaries and expenses	6, 547, 000	6, 147, 000	5, 872, 000	−675, 000	−275, 000
	Federal Prison System:					
67 and S. 24	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	449, 000	125, 000	449, 000		+324, 000
67	Support of United States prisoners	139, 000	139, 000	139, 000		
67	Buildings and facilities	1, 380, 000	1, 380, 000	1, 380, 000		
	Total, Department of Justice	8, 675, 000	7, 821, 000	7, 870, 000	−805, 000	+49, 000

[1] $36,500, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Contributions to International Organizations."

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
67	Civil Aeronautics Administration: Claims, Federal Airport Act	$1, 464, 384	$1, 464, 384	$1, 464, 384		
67	Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses	25, 000	25, 000		−$25, 000	−$25, 000
	Coast and Geodetic Survey:					
67	Salaries and expenses, departmental	450, 000	450, 000	450, 000		
67	Salaries and expenses, field	70, 000	70, 000	70, 000		
	Bureau of Public Roads:					
67	Tongass Forest highways, Alaska	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000		
67	Public lands highways	750, 000	750, 000	750, 000		
	Total, Department of Commerce	6, 259, 384	6, 259, 384	6, 234, 384	−25, 000	−25, 000
	THE JUDICIARY					
	Other courts and services:					
67	Fees of commissioners	25, 000	25, 000	25, 000		

67	Fees of jurors	300, 000	200, 000	200, 000	−100, 000	
	Total, the Judiciary	325, 000	225, 000	225, 000	−100, 000	
	Total State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary (ch. III)	114, 229, 384	23, 839, 323	23, 863, 323	−90, 366, 061	+24, 000
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT					
67	Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	330, 000	130, 000	130, 000	−200, 000	
	Coast Guard:					
67	Operating expenses	1, 100, 000	1, 000, 000		−1, 100, 000	−1, 000, 000
67	Acquisition, construction, and improvements	650, 000	350, 000	350, 000	−300, 000	
	Total, Coast Guard	1, 750, 000	1, 350, 000	350, 000		
	Total, Treasury Department	2, 080, 000	1, 480, 000	480, 000	−1, 600, 000	−1, 000, 000
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT					
	(Out of the postal revenues)					
67	Postal operations	15, 000, 000	7, 500, 000	15, 000, 000		+7, 500, 000
67	Transportation of mails	152, 000, 000	152, 000, 000	152, 000, 000		
67	Clerks, first- and second-class post offices, 1947	[2] *150, 000*	[2] *150, 000*	[2] *150, 000*		
67	Railroad transportation and mail messenger service, 1948	[3] *200, 000*	[3] *200, 000*	[3] *200, 000*		
	Total, Post Office Department	167, 000, 000	159, 500, 000	167, 000, 000		+7, 500, 000
	Total, Treasury-Post Office (ch. IV)	169, 080, 000	160, 980, 000	167, 480, 000	−1, 600, 000	+6, 500, 000

[2] To be derived by transfer from "Clerks, third-class offices, 1947."
[3] To be derived by transfer from "Domestic air mail service, 1948."

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION					
67	Employees' compensation fund, 1951	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000		
	FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY					
S. 23	Office of Education: Grants for surveys and school construction	50,000,000		50,000,000		+$50,000,000
	Total, Labor-Federal Security (ch. V)	53,000,000	3,000,000	53,000,000		+50,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
67	Control of forest pests: Forest Pest Control Act	370,000		345,000	−$25,000	+345,000
67	Forest Service:					
	Forest development roads and trails	5,800,000	3,000,000	5,800,000		+2,800,000
	Payments to States	1,351,150			−1,351,150	
57	Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses	(3,850,000)	(2,750,000)	(2,750,000)	(−1,100,000)	
	Total, Agriculture Department (ch. VI)	7,521,150	3,000,000	6,145,000	−1,376,150	+3,145,000

	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
67	Commission of Fine Arts: Salaries and expenses	3, 000	2, 000	2, 000	−1, 000	
67	Bureau of Mines: Construction	350, 000		350, 000		+350, 000
67	Territories and Island Possessions: Construction Alaska Railroad	4, 500, 000	4, 000, 000	4, 500, 000		+500, 000
84	Bureau of Indian Affairs	3, 650, 000	3, 650, 000	3, 650, 000		
	Total, Department of the Interior (ch. VII)	8, 503, 000	7, 652, 000	8, 502, 000	−1, 000	+850, 000
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
67	Civil Service Commission: Annuities, Lighthouse Service widows	219, 500	204, 500	204, 500	−15, 000	
	General Services Administration:					
67	Strategic and critical materials	(4)	(4)	(4)		
95	Decentralization of Federal activities	20, 000, 000	0		−20, 000, 000	
S. 19	Office of Housing Expediter: Salaries and expenses	(5)		(5)		
	Veterans' Administration:					
67	Compensation and pensions	26, 618, 000	26, 618, 000	26, 618, 000		
67	Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans	800, 000	800, 000	800, 000		

[4] Amount heretofore authorized to be transferred to the appropriation "Operating expenses" for reactivation of industrial plants increased from "$14,000,000" to $26,000,000."

[5] Limitation on terminal leave reduced from "$2,000,000" to "$1,000,000."

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bil compared with—	
					Budget estimates	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
	Maritime Activities:					
83	Maritime training	(6)	(6)	(6)		
83	Vessel operations revolving fund	$25, 000, 000	$20, 000, 000	$20, 000, 000	−$5, 000, 000	
	Total, independent offices (ch. VIII)	72, 637, 500	47, 622, 500	47, 622, 500	−25, 015, 000	
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
	CIVIL FUNCTIONS					
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS					
67	Niagara Power Development	[7] *450, 000*	[7] *450, 000*	[7] *450, 000*		
	THE PANAMA CANAL					
81	Civil Government	[8] *72, 500*	[8] *72, 500*	[8] *72, 500*		
	Total, Department of the Army (ch. IX)					
67	Funds appropriated to the President: International Children's Welfare Work (ch. X)	12, 500, 000	5, 000, 000	7, 500, 000	−5, 000, 000	+2, 500, 000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
69	Expenses of Defense Production	$51, 000, 000	$33, 029, 000	$27, 331, 895	−23, 668, 105	−5, 697, 105

	INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
68	Federal Civil Defense Administration:					
	Operations	[9] 128, 000, 000	1, 750, 000	74, 000, 000	−54, 000, 000	+72, 250, 000
	Federal contributions	[10] 250,000, 000	[11] 80, 000, 000		−250, 000, 000	−80, 000, 000
	Procurement fund	25, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	−15, 000, 000	+5, 000, 000
	Emergency fund	0	100, 000, 000			−100, 000, 000
	Total, Federal Civil Defense Administration	403, 000, 000	186, 750, 000	84, 000, 000	−319, 000, 000	−102, 750, 000
	Total (ch. XI)	454, 000, 000	219, 779, 000	111, 331, 895	−342, 668, 105	−108, 447, 105
	JUDGMENTS AND CLAIMS					
85 and S. 25	Judgments and authorized claims (ch. XII)	3, 103, 881	1, 999, 045	3, 103, 881		+1, 104, 836
	Grand total	896, 116, 293	473, 165, 368	430, 102, 477	−466, 013, 816	−43, 062, 891

[6] Limitation on administrative personal services increased from "$2,477,000" to "$2,532,000."
[7] To be derived by transfer from "Flood control, general."
[8] To be derived by transfer from "Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal."
[9] Includes Federal contributions for organizational and communication equipment.
[10] For protective facilities only.
[11] Includes $75,000,000 for protective facilities; $5,000,000 for communications equipment.

O

Calendar No. 281

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

[Report No. 302]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 11 (legislative day, MARCH 26), 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 30 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951
Reported by Mr. HAYDEN, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of Revenues of the District of Columbia)

General Administration

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Office of the Corporation Counsel", $5,000; and the limitation under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951 on the amount available for the settlement of claims is increased from "$7,000" to "$12,000".

Fiscal Service

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

For additional amounts for "Collector's Office", fiscal year 1949, $653,568, and fiscal year 1951, $144,700.

Courts

UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "United States courts", $265,443.

Public Welfare

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For additional amounts for "Saint Elizabeths Hospital", fiscal year 1949, $13,704, and fiscal year 1950, $22,604.

Settlement of Claims and Suits

For an additional amount for the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in ac-

1 cordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11,
2 1929, as amended (46 Stat. 500), $7,493.

3 JUDGMENTS

4 For the payment of final judgments rendered against
5 the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Document
6 Numbered 67 (82d Congress), together with such further
7 sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceed-
8 ing 4 per centum per annum on such judgments, as provided
9 by law, from the date the same became due until the date
10 of payment, $5,580.

11 AUDITED CLAIMS

12 For an additional amount for the payment of claims,
13 certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District
14 of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which
15 have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the
16 District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title
17 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1948
18 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in House Document Num-
19 bered 67 (82d Congress), $4,648.

20 CHAPTER II

21 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

22 *SENATE*

23 *For payment to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Junior, son,*
24 *and Barbara Vandenberg Bailey and Elizabeth Vandenberg*

Pfeiffer, daughters, of Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $12,500.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

For an additional amount for "Furniture and repairs", $17,878.

House of Representatives

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", $1,000, to remain available until expended.

Architect of the Capitol

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For an additional amount, for liquidation of contract authority, for the House and Senate improvements authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the Acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472), Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, $268,000, of which $168,000 shall be available for the House improvements and $100,000 for the Senate improvements.

For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings", $3,000.

1 *SENATE RESTAURANTS*

2 *For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor*
3 *and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to pro-*
4 *vide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Build-*
5 *ing, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the*
6 *supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Adminis-*
7 *tration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes,*
8 *as amended, $30,000.*

9 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

10 For an additonal amount for "House office buildings",
11 including furniture and furnishings, $21,500.

12 *GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE*

13 *WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND*
14 *BINDING*

15 *For an additional amount for "Working capital and con-*
16 *gressional printing and binding", $1,200,000: Provided,*
17 *That the limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch*
18 *Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for the*
19 *printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register*
20 *in accordance with the Act approved July 26, 1935 (44*
21 *U. S. C. 301–310), is increased from "$475,000" to*
22 *"$675,000".*

1 CHAPTER III

2 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

3 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

4 For an additional amount for "American sections, inter-
5 national commissions", $36,500, which shall be derived by
6 transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to inter-
7 national organizations"; and appropriations granted under
8 this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available to enable
9 the President to perform the obligations of the United States
10 under the treaty between the United States of America and
11 Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the
12 United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

13 INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL
14 ACTIVITIES

15 For an additional amount for "International information
16 and educational activities", for facilities for radio transmis-
17 sion and reception, and so forth, as authorized in the third
18 proviso under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation
19 Act, 1951, $9,533,939, to remain available until expended;
20 and the limitation contained in said proviso is increased from
21 "$41,288,000" to "$50,821,939".

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", $30,000.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", ~~$6,147,000~~ *$5,872,000*; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for the purchase of seven hundred passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided.

Federal Prison System

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", ~~$125,000~~ *$449,000*.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $139,000.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities", $1,380,000, for replacement of the power and heating

1 plants of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia:
2 *Provided,* That the limitation under this head in the Depart-
3 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1951, on the cost of
4 completion of the replacement of a power plant at the
5 United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, is repealed.

6 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

7 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

8 CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

9 For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport
10 Act", $1,464,384, to remain available until June 30, 1953,
11 as follows: Visalia Municipal Airport, Visalia, California,
12 $40,277; Gainesville Municipal Airport, Gainesville, Florida,
13 $9,467; Waycross-Ware County Airport, the city of Way-
14 cross and Ware County, Georgia, $55,417; Harding Field,
15 the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $140,650; New
16 Orleans Airport, Orleans Levee District and the Orleans
17 Airport Commission, Louisiana, $257,237; Laurence G.
18 Hanscom Field, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, $91,-
19 528; English Field, Amarillo, Texas, $29,590; Rio Grande
20 Valley International Airport, Brownsville, Texas, $384,161;
21 Eaker Airfield, Durant, Oklahoma, $359,580; Jefferson
22 County Airport, Jefferson County, Texas, $40,593; and the
23 Draughon-Miller Municipal Airport, Temple, Texas,
24 $55,884: *Provided,* That no request for reimbursement of
25 the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed

under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952 of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair.

~~CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD~~

~~CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

~~For an additional amount for "Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses", $25,000.~~

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, departmental", $450,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FIELD

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, field", $70,000.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

TONGASS FOREST HIGHWAYS, ALASKA

For surveys, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the

1 contract authorization granted by section 10 of the Federal-
2 Aid Highway Act of 1950, $750,000, to remain available
3 until expended.

4 THE JUDICIARY

5 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

6 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

7 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Fees
8 of commissioners", $25,000.

9 FEES OF JURORS

10 For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", $200,000.

11 CHAPTER IV

12 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

13 BUREAU OF THE MINT

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
16 $130,000.

17 COAST GUARD

18 ~~OPERATING EXPENSES~~

19 ~~For an additonal amount for "Operating expenses",~~
20 ~~$1,000,000.~~

21 ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

22 For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction,

and improvements", $350,000, to remain available until expended.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

Postal Operations

For an additional amount for "Postal operations", ~~$7,500,000~~ *$15,000,000*.

Transportation of Mails

For an additional amount for "Transportation of mails", for payment of increased rates to railroad carriers for 1951 and prior fiscal years, in accordance with Interstate Commerce Commission Order of December 4, 1950 (Docket Numbered 9200), $152,000,000.

Field Service, Post Office Department

OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Clerks, First- and Second-Class Post Offices

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Clerks, first- and second-class post offices", $150,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Clerks, third-class post offices, 1947".

OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Rail-

road transportation and mail messenger service", $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Domestic air mail service, 1948".

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employees' Compensation

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation fund", $3,000,000.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Office of Education

GRANTS FOR SURVEYS AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and school construction", to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities: Provided, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under this head, shall also be available to enable the Commissioner to provide school facilities pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815).

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Control of Forest Pests

FOREST PEST CONTROL ACT

For an additional amount for "Forest Pest Control Act", $345,000.

Forest Service

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For an additional amount for "Forest development roads and trails", ~~$3,000,000~~ *$5,800,000*, to remain available until expended.

Commodity Credit Corporation

The limitation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is increased from $16,350,000" to "$19,100,000".

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Commission of Fine Arts

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $2,000.

1 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

2 CONSTRUCTION

3 For an additional amount for "Construction", $3,650,-
4 000, to remain available until expended.

5 *BUREAU OF MINES*

6 *CONSTRUCTION*

7 *For an additional amount for "Construction", $350,000,*
8 *to remain available until expended.*

9 TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

10 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

11 For an additional amount for "Construction, Alaska
12 Railroad", ~~$4,000,000~~ *$4,500,000,* to remain available until
13 expended.

14 CHAPTER VIII

15 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

16 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

17 ANNUITIES, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WIDOWS

18 For payment of annuities as authorized by the Act of
19 August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465), $204,500.

20 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

21 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

22 The amount authorized to be transferred from the ap-
23 propriation granted under this head in the Supplemental
24 Appropriation Act, 1951, to the appropriation "Operating

1 expenses", for the reactivation of industrial plants, is increased
2 from "$14,000,000" to "$26,000,000".

3 EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

4 Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal
5 year 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and
6 improvements to public buildings under the control of the
7 General Services Administration.

8 *Office of the Housing Expediter*

9 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

10 *The amount made available under this head in the*
11 *Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the*
12 *payment of terminal leave is changed from "$2,000,000" to*
13 *"$1,000,000".*

14 Veterans' Administration

15 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

16 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
17 sions", $26,618,000, to remain available until expended.

18 AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR DISABLED
19 VETERANS

20 To enable the Administrator to provide, or assist in pro-
21 viding, automobiles or other conveyances for disabled vet-
22 erans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950
23 (Public Law 798), $800,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

2 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

3 MARITIME TRAINING

4 The limitation under the head "Maritime training",
5 United States Maritime Commission, in the Independent
6 Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available
7 for administrative personal services and so forth is increased
8 from "$2,477,000" to "$2,532,000".

9 VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

10 For working capital for the "Vessel Operations Revolv-
11 ing Fund", which is hereby created for the purpose of carry-
12 ing out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Com-
13 merce, including charter, operation, maintenance, repair, re-
14 conditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the
15 jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, $20,000,000, to
16 remain available until expended.

17 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for
18 shipping services rendered under said Fund shall be pre-
19 scribed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Fund shall
20 be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities
21 conducted thereunder: *Provided,* That the provisions of sec-
22 tions 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) and 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-
23 eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be appli-
24 cable in connection with such operations and to seamen
25 employed through general agents as employees of the United

States, who may be employed in accordance with customary commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwithstanding the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the employment of persons by the United States: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 per centum of vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this Fund to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as stated therein: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any working funds or of allocation accounts established, subsequent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore and hereafter received from such activities, may be transferred to and consolidated with this Fund, which shall be available for the purposes of such working funds or allocation accounts.

~~No money appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United~~

~~States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided,* That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further,* That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 per centum per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the~~

~~Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.~~

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Functions, Department of the Army

THE PANAMA CANAL

CIVIL GOVERNMENT

For an additional amount for "Civil government", $72,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal."

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

~~NIAGARA POWER DEVELOPMENT~~ *NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT REMEDIAL WORKS INVESTIGATION*

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until expended, $450,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Flood control, general".

1 CHAPTER X

2 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

3 INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK

4 To enable the President, during the fiscal year 1951, to
5 carry out the provisions of title V of the Foreign Economic
6 Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 209), relating to inter-
7 national children's welfare work, ~~$5,000,000~~ *$7,500,000.*

8 CHAPTER XI

9 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

10 EXPENSES OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION

11 For an additional amount for "Expenses of defense
12 production", ~~$33,029,000~~ *$27,331,895*: *Provided,* That ap-
13 propriations under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be
14 available for rental of buildings or parts thereof in the Dis-
15 trict of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations,
16 and improvements necessary for the proper use by the Gov-
17 ernment, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30,
18 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a): *Provided further,*
19 That the appropriation to the President for Emergencies
20 (National Defense) shall be reimbursed from funds con-
21 tained herein for allocations made therefrom to any agency
22 of the Government for carrying out the provisions of the
23 Defense Production Act of 1950 after March 31, 1951:
24 *Provided further,* That the aggregate of borrowings from
25 the Treasury pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense

1 Production Act of 1950 which may be outstanding at any
2 one time is increased from "$600,000,000" to "$1,600,-
3 000,000": *Provided further,* That any appropriation to any
4 department, agency, or corporation, in the executive branch
5 of the Government, for salaries and expenses, shall be avail-
6 able *by transfer or otherwise* for the discharge of responsi-
7 bilities, relating to the national defense, assigned to such
8 department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law
9 ~~: *Provided further,* That the appropriation "Expenses of~~
10 ~~Defense Production" may be increased by transfer of not to~~
11 ~~exceed $1,834,000 of funds appropriated for the fiscal year~~
12 ~~1951 to the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior,~~
13 ~~Labor, and the General Services Administration for the pur-~~
14 ~~pose of carrying out the duties and responsibilities assigned~~
15 ~~to these agencies under provisions of the Defense Production~~
16 ~~Act of 1950~~.

17 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

18 FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

19 OPERATIONS

20 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in
21 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act
22 of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including pur-
23 chase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor
24 vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
25 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the

Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; *security guard services;* and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; ~~$1,750,000: *Provided,* That $110,000 shall be available for providing civil defense communications systems pursuant to subsection (c) of section 201 of said Act~~ *$74,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952.*

~~FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS~~

~~For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided,* That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further,* That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.~~

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement fund", which is hereby established for the purpose of

1 financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of mate-
2 rials or organizational equipment for which financial con-
3 tributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made
4 on a matching basis by subsection (i) of section 201 of the
5 Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, ~~$5,000,000~~ *$10,000,000.*
6 Said fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said
7 materials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance,
8 or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable
9 appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such
10 materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to
11 any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of
12 materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be
13 in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

14 ~~CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND~~

15 ~~For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund", $100,000,~~
16 ~~000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided,*~~
17 ~~That said fund shall be available only in the event of a~~
18 ~~proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as pro-~~
19 ~~vided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of~~
20 ~~1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress) and shall be ex-~~
21 ~~pended in accordance with the powers vested in the Presi-~~
22 ~~dent and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Adminis-~~
23 ~~tration by title III of said Act.~~

CHAPTER XII

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in *Senate Document Numbered 25, and* House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-second Congress, ~~$1,999,045~~ *$3,103,881,* together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further,* That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

1 CHAPTER XIII

2 GENERAL PROVISIONS

3 *Sec. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in*
4 *this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any*
5 *corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the*
6 *salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against*
7 *the Government of the United States or who is a member of*
8 *an organization of Government employees that asserts the*
9 *right to strike against the Government of the United States,*
10 *or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that*
11 *advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United*
12 *States by force or violence: Provided, That for the purposes*
13 *hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence*
14 *that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the*
15 *provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the*
16 *Government of the United States, is not a member of an*
17 *organization of Government employees that asserts the right*
18 *to strike against the Government of the United States, or*
19 *that such person does not advocate, and is not a member*
20 *of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Gov-*
21 *ernment of the United States by force or violence: Provided*
22 *further, That any person who engages in a strike against the*
23 *Government of the United States or who is a member of an*

1 *organization of Government employees that asserts the right*
2 *to strike against the Government of the United States, or*
3 *who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that*
4 *advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United*
5 *States by force or violence and accepts employment the*
6 *salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation*
7 *or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,*
8 *upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or*
9 *imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: Provided*
10 *further, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition*
11 *to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of*
12 *existing law: Provided further, That, as applicable to the*
13 *Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this sec-*
14 *tion shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person*
15 *employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work*
16 *involving the loss of human life or destruction of property,*
17 *and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such*
18 *persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered*
19 *in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-*
20 *templated by this section.*

21 SEC. 1302. This Act may be cited as the "Third Sup-
22 plemental Appropriation Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives April 10, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Calendar No. 281

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

[Report No. 302]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

APRIL 11 (legislative day, MARCH 26), 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 30 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951
Reported with amendments

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1951 No. 77

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of our spirits whose power is unsearchable, whose judgments are a great deep: We quiet our feverish hearts in Thy presence. We would be still and know that Thou art God. As amid the earthquake, wind and fire of this violent world we wait at the week's beginning for Thy still small voice, give us sensitive ears to listen, teachable minds to learn, humble wills to obey.

Here, today, in this Chamber of national deliberation let some revelation of Thy light fall on our darkness, some guidance from Thy wisdom save us in our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource strengthen us in our need. Acknowledging our oneness with all humanity we come as patriots, believing that our America has come to the kingdom for such a time as this. Our Nation's welfare, dear to us, grateful for its best traditions, anxious for its present perilous state, prayerful for its sons who this very hour are fighting in Liberty's cause, we come crying for wisdom in our national leaders, that we may contribute worthily to mankind's abiding peace. We ask it in that name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 27, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement of Friday last, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] continues his address, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate, and without speeches, and without prejudicing the right of the Senator from New Mexico to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, did I understand the distinguished majority leader to request unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business before the Senator from New Mexico begins his address?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I have asked that it be done, without prejudicing the right of the Senator from New Mexico to the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is agreeable to me.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BALTIMORE (MD.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, resolutions dealing with the necessity for reduction of nondefense spending and other vital matters affecting the administration of the Federal Government during these critical days were adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce last week.

Favorably considered on the recommendation of the association's committee on national affairs, of which Frank B. Ober is chairman, the resolutions voice the considered opinion of the representative body of the businessmen of the Baltimore area and will find support, I am sure, among businessmen from all sections of the country.

I send the four resolutions to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions presented by Mr. O'CONOR were referred as follows:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, favoring prompt action by the Congress on further recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments;

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to nondefense spending; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments;

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to the Wage Stabilization Board; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to the reactivation of the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3587. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 302).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 303);

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304);

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 305); and

S. 1254. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 306).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Maija Sisko Erkkila (also known as Maija Sisko Leskinen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1413. A bill to permit the retention of oil, gas, and other mineral rights in lands condemned by the United States for waterway improvement purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; and

S. 1415. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. NIXON):

S. 1416. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Lefrancois and Chamberland, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

An address discussing foreign policy and domestic administration, delivered by him to the Republican 21 Club of Massachusetts, at Worcester, Mass., on April 28, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the subject Export of America's Freedoms, delivered by him and broadcast from Station WGN in Chicago on April 28, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Excerpt from an address by him on the policy of the United States in Asia, delivered before the Pennsylvania Greeters Association, Chapter No. 41, in Washington, Pa., April 28, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Issues Are Global, MacArthur Insists," from the Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 20, 1951, with reference to General MacArthur's address to the Congress on April 19, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Alternatives in Korea," from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 11, 1951, discussing the pronouncements by General MacArthur on the Korean War.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Acheson and MacArthur," published in the Washington Post of April 28, 1951, dealing with the controversy regarding General MacArthur.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "War in Korea Profitable for United States 'Partners'," written by Larry Rue and published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of April 22, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed by Hon. Harold E. Stassen to the President suggesting reconciliation between the President and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune on the same subject.

By Mr. THYE:

An editorial under the caption "This business of farming—Washington is worried," discussing factors entering into a possible reduced agricultural production, written by Paul C. Johnson and published in the Prairie Farmer of April 21, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article by Joseph P. Lyford regarding the reaction in Italy to the MacArthur incident, published in the Hartford Times.

PRICE CONTROLS AS APPLIED TO LIVESTOCK AND MEAT INDUSTRY—LETTER FROM GOVERNING BOARD OF MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the governing board of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association. It is a very important letter in view of the order issued by the Price Stabilization Administrator, Mr. Michael DiSalle.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 18, 1951.

Mr. MICHAEL DISALLE,
Price Stabilization Administrator,
Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DISALLE: The governing board of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders Association met in the office of its secretary, Mr. J. S. Jones, on Monday, April 16, 1951, and reaffirmed the position taken by its membership, consisting of approximately 2,500 breeders and feeders, assembled in annual meeting at the University of Minnesota on February 2, 1951, relative to price controls as they apply to the livestock and meat industry.

Representatives of the livestock and meat industry do fear inflation. However, they know from experience gained in World War II that price controls do not cure the disease, but only hide its symptoms temporarily. They know that restrictions reduce the supply of meat and increase inflationary pressures. They fully realize that the principal domestic problem confronting the people of America today is that of defending the purchasing power of the dollar. They realize that if this is not done, their savings, savings bonds, and insurance contracts will not be worth much to them in the future.

The answer to this inflationary problem is increased production and a cut-back in purchasing power. The farm people believe that they can increase their production level to a point equal to, or above, that attained during World War II. This can be accomplished through improved cultural methods, increased use of commercial fertilizers, the employment of new varieties of seed, and efficient types of livestock, pasture improvement programs, and by other means. A cut-back in purchasing power can be realized if a sound monetary and fiscal policy is adopted by the Federal Government.

There are some people who evidently believe that price controls applied to the livestock and meat industry will tend to curb this vicious inflationary spiral. This is not a fact. The application of controls is definitely inflationary rather than deflationary, because it results in a cut-back in production. Even the threat of controls is resulting in decreased production at a time when we should have all-out production. The application of controls to the livestock and meat industry will also result in the development of "black markets" due, largely, to the fact that livestock cannot be controlled at its source. Whenever we depart from the functioning of the free market, through the application of price controls, the Government will have to assume the responsibility for doing those things that are normally done by price in the free market. The farm people fully believe that if prices are fixed, that move will soon be accompanied by rationing and subsidies.

Perhaps the greatest objection to the price control program is that it typifies the very thing this country is fighting to avoid, namely, the imposition of Government regulations on the free market system, which in the past has made this country great. It is imperative that controls be applied sparingly less the productive energies and the initiative of our people be so dulled that they may never again recover.

Those enaged in the livestock business realize that those sections of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which provide for the imposition of controls will expire on June 30, 1951. Undoubtedly, hearings on this measure will be held sometime within the near future. The members of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association are definitely of the opinion that the price control program that is now being developed can be, and should be, thrown out. They believe that if it were possible to apply effective controls clear across the board, including not only the prices of all commodities, but the wages and salaries of labor as well, it might be the thing to do at this particular time, but they think that we must be realistic and practical and recognize that this cannot be done. Wages have been pretty well "thawed out", as you know, through the recognition of escalator clauses, annual improvement factors, a 10 percent increase after January 15, 1950, and the exemption of Federal, State, and municipal employees.

The livestock and meat industry is definitely in a chaotic situation today. The livestock breeders of the State of Minnesota sincerely believe that the answer to the inflationary problem is increased production, which can be had, and will be had, if the Government maintains a policy of "hands off," and through the curbing of purchasing power by modification of the monetary and fiscal policies of the Federal Government.

Price and wage controls are not the answer to this problem. If our Federal Government insists on continuing its efforts to develop a price and wage control program, the livestock people are very much afraid that production will be cut back at a time when all-out production is needed, and that this country will lose its freedoms in the process.

Very truly yours,

MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION,
J. S. JONES, *Secretary.*

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—STATEMENT BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by former President Herbert Hoover before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency this morning during the consideration by the committee of a measure to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, APRIL 30, 1951

Your committee has requested me to advise you of my views upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I presume this request arises from the original creation of the RFC upon my recommendation and from the investigation into it by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which I was chairman.

1. I believe that the RFC should be liquidated.

2. It should be liquidated by its new Administrator.

I must emphasize again that this document was not a formulation of political policy, but a development of information policy essential to a coordinated foreign-information program. As such it has been superseded in the light of events.

As to its preparation, you will recall that I stated to the Appropirations Committee that I considered it unwise and contrary to the public interest to indicate which officers in the Department participated, other than to state that 10 different officers in 4 offices within the Department participated in the drafting and clearing of this document. It must be recognized that papers of this kind are always the result of a give-and-take of views among the various persons on the working level. If the names of the people who participated in drafting documents were to be made public, the inevitable tendency would be for each to keep a careful record of his precise contribution or attitude on any controversial subject. A department in which officers on the working level are busily engaged in making records against one another would, of course, not function as efficiently as one in which the principle of effective responsibility of the top officials is recognized.

With respect to the other classified documents which you request, I am sure you will understand, in view of the pending hearings by the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, that it is necessary for the Department to await the request of the chairman for any classified documents of this nature. At such time the Department will give careful consideration to any such request.

I am sending a copy of your letter and my reply to Senator RUSSELL for his information.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3587, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, this is the so-called third supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In this bill there are appropriations for the Voice of America and for several defense items. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that there will be considerable debate on the bill? Several Senators have asked me if I felt that we could conclude consideration of the bill in 1 day. I wonder what the judgment of the Senator is.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can see no reason why it cannot be concluded tomorrow without difficulty. There are some disagreements, but the amendments which have been submitted are comparatively minor, so far as the printed amendments are concerned. I have heard of no desire for extended debate. I think the bill can be promptly disposed of. I wanted to make it the unfinished business with the idea that we would proceed the first thing tomorrow to read the bill for amendment.

I now ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. HAYDEN. The usual request, that the committee amendments be first considered before amendments offered from the floor are considered.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the source and inspiration of everything that is high and holy we pray that we may be more keenly aware of Thy presence and power as we enter upon this new week.

Grant unto us that strength and serenity, that faith and fortitude of mind and heart which we need as we accept the challenge of imperishable ideals and principles.

We pray that we may be a united people and have a clearer vision and appreciation of the multiplied power which we shall experience through our union in service for our beloved country.

Make us tireless in our efforts and unrelenting in our hope of the coming of that day when justice and righteousness and peace shall be established upon the earth.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whose supreme purpose and greatest joy was to do Thy holy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 4, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 321. An act to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina;

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 859. An act for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic;

H. R. 1150. An act for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of Pietro Giannettino;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden;

H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;

H. R. 1438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez;

H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat;

H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos;

H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano;

H. R. 2654. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 2714. An act for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte;

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3291. An act to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 3292. An act to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter;

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz;

H. R. 2782. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 24. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended;

S. 275. An act for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik;

S. 291. An act for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly;

S. 297. An act for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu;

S. 370. An act for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene;

S. 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota;

S. 536. An act for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw;

S. 677. An act to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

S. 879. An act for the relief of Luigi Podesta;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi;

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1025. An act to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

delightful of men and one of the best Senators in this body.

Mr. President, I take the greatest pleasure in making this statement.

THE LATE SENATOR VANDENBERG—EDITORIAL TRIBUTE IN THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 20 paying tribute to the great departed statesman from Michigan, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VANDENBERG

No American of his day symbolized so well as Arthur Vandenberg his country's response to the world's demand for leadership. None played so crucial a part in building a bridge from isolationism to internationalism.

Essentially a pragmatist, he typified American adaptability, a capacity to learn and to grow. Skilled in the art of reconciling differences in order to get action, he devised practical and popular compromises. Converted from sturdy midwestern provincialism, he understood what was needed to convert others.

As ranking member in 1945 of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he could have followed the course of Henry Cabot Lodge in 1920. If he had, enough Republicans might have followed him to repeat with the United Nations the tragic story of America's refusals to join the League of Nations. But Arthur Vandenberg did not believe in defying facts.

It was a dramatic moment when he arose in the Senate 7 months before the end of the war to chart his new course:

"The fraternity of war must be made the fraternity of peace. * * * Our oceans no longer protect our ramparts. * * * No nation can immunize itself hereafter against these disasters by reliance upon itself alone."

From then on the former reporter from Grand Rapids loomed as a world statesman. He did not slavishly accept every project put forward by the majority leaders. But, having accepted the basic concept of internationalism, he did not try to block the practical application of the policy. He did not forego criticism, but aimed it toward perfecting and making politically acceptable the necessary instruments of policy. His hand was visible not only in UN but in reshaping the Truman doctrine, in the Marshall plan, and in the Atlantic Pact.

His work stands as a lasting example of an intelligent American's response to events.

COMMITTEE DRAFT OF THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM FOR CURRENT YEAR

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on yesterday, in my capacity as a delegate member of the Republican State convention of New Jersey, I received a committee draft of the Republican platform for the current year. Because it presents a record of rich accomplishment and serves as a guide to future attainments of major importance to the people of my State, its careful study by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle could serve a very useful purpose. That it may be available for such study, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD and that my remarks in respect thereto be incorporated in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WITHOUT PRECEDENT—EDITORIAL FROM NEWARK NEWS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the Newark Sunday News of May 6 there appeared an editorial which very clearly described the dilemma in which free government finds itself in its honest effort to fully enlighten its people as it meets its obligations to other nations. I hope that this editorial will be the subject of careful study by every single Member of this body, and to that end, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITHOUT PRECEDENT

On the steps of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, opening the 1951 Festival of Britain, the Archbishop of Canterbury uttered a sentence that provides an almost perfect text for the Senate hearings at Washington on far eastern policies. The archbishop said: "We must not frustrate the future."

Korea, with its casualties, its limitations, its sense of stalemate, General MacArthur cites as an example of complete frustration, both now and for the visible future, unless a wider decision is sought. But the whole world is suffering from the dreadful frustration of the results of World War II. To risk a third general war, in which the United States might find itself without allies, except for Chiang Kai-shek, appears to President Truman to put to hazard our national survival and the fruits of western civilization. This could mean lethal frustration of the future of mankind.

Such are the basic, opposing points of view being brought out at the Senate hearings. When Woodrow Wilson argued for open covenants reached through open negotiation, he was denounced as an impractical theorist. Now, there is the spectacle of the most powerful government among the free countries, pausing in the midst of fateful undertakings to determine, in public hearings, whether its foreign policies are sound, whether its concept of world leadership is valid.

There is no precedent for such a hearing, which involves publication of current documents, paraphrased in haste to protect invaluable secret codes; disclosure of strategic studies of enormous interest to potential enemies; statements of fact and opinion bound to reveal the scope and effectiveness of American and allied intelligence; open estimates of the intentions and armed strength of the Soviet Union and much other critical information.

Under normal procedure, which was followed up to and through World War II, such information would not be made available to the public until a war had been won, diplomatic and strategic objectives attained, events had run their course. Such information, often even then not disclosed in full, is the material of published official reports and memoirs. Such publications are of historical, rather than of current, interest.

But in the Senate hearings the raw materials of history are being exposed while history is still being written. It is being debated how and where and under what circumstances Americans should die while Americans are, in fact, dying in Korea. It is being debated whether American lives and resources should be put to further hazard in the Far East, while one of the most distinguished of American soldiers, General Eisenhower, is attempting to speed up and expand the defenses of Western Europe.

General MacArthur believes now, as he believed when he was in command in the Pacific in World War II, that the United States can fight a global war. That was not the opinion of Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill and their combined Chiefs of Staff. They made Hitler the first order of business, Hirohito the second. Mr. Truman and his Joint Chiefs of Staff have a similar viewpoint today.

It is for this reason, which is a sound reason, that the authorities at Washington do not wish to expand the war in the Far East, with the danger of Soviet intervention, while the defenses of Western Europe are in no condition to offer more than token resistance to a soviet advance toward the shores of the Atlantic. That is the crux of the differences between General MacArthur and the President.

The appeal, as General MacArthur himself recognizes, is to public opinion. The political overtones are obvious. A generation ago, at the time of World War I, American and English liberals argued for democratic control of foreign policies—a project that was deemed unacceptable. It is here now, spreading in waves of emotion and excitement, from the caucus room at Washington, where the Senate hearings are being held. It is an experiment that will have a fateful outcome, however the issue is decided where it will be decided—at the Presidential election of 1952.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter II—Legislative branch," on page 3, after line 21, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., son, and Barbara Vandenberg Bailey and Elizabeth Vandenberg Pfeiffer, daughters, of Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

For an additional amount for "Furniture and repairs," $17,878.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

SENATE RESTAURANTS

For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to provide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Building, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For an additional amount for "Working capital and congressional printing and binding," $1,200,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register in

accordance with the act approved July 26, 1935 (44 U. S. C. 301-310), is increased from "$475,000" to "$675,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and expenses," on page 7, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$6,147,000" and insert "$5,872,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal prison system—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," on page 7, line 16, after the word "Prisons", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$449,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce," on page 9, after line 5, to strike out:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses," $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Treasury Department—Coast Guard," on page 10, after line 17, to strike out:

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses," $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—(Out of the postal revenues)—Postal operations," on page 11, line 7, after the word "operations", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V," on page 12, after line 9, to insert:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Grants for surveys and school construction

For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and school construction," to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities: *Provided,* That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under this head shall also be available to enable the Commissioner to provide school facilities pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815).

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma desired to offer an amendment to this item. If the amendment is adopted, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma be permitted to offer an amendment at a later time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are simply passing over the amendment temporarily. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VI—Department of Agriculture," on page 13, after line 2, to insert:

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

FOREST PEST CONTROL ACT

For an additional amount for "Forest Pest Control Act," $345,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Forest development roads and trails," on page 13, line 10, after the word "trails", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VII—Department of the Interior," on page 14, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction," $350,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Territories and island possessions—Construction, Alaska Railroad," on page 14, line 12, after the word "Railroad", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VIII—Independent offices," on page 15, after line 7, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the payment of terminal leave is changed from "$2,000,000" to "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Commerce—Maritime activities—Vessel operations revolving fund," on page 17, after line 20, to strike out:

No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided,* That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further,* That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bare boat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment to this paragraph which I should like to submit at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, in line 4, after the word "provisions" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude payment of an amount for any vessel or the use thereof in any case in which such amount shall have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be just compensation therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is offered to the text of the bill which is proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment, and therefore the vote on the Senators amendment would come before the vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this an amendment to language which would be stricken out by the committee amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is.

Mr. President, let me ask the chairman of the committee whether he wishes to pass over this amendment and return to it later. I understand there will be considerable discussion of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not understand there would be much discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that the committee's position is based on an opinion of the legislative counsel to the effect that the paragraph would be unconstitutional. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a letter from the legislative counsel in regard to a suggestion which would remove that objection, put the paragraph in perfect shape, and also go along with ideas of the Comptroller General.

With the adoption of the amendment I have just offered, I wonder whether the result would be to have the committee amendment taken to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The thought was that by striking out the entire paragraph the provision would go to conference; and then if the House of Representatives had a suggestion such as the one the Senator from Delaware has made, we might consider it in conference. However, the committee has not passed upon the subject matter of the Senator's amendment, and therefore I would not be inclined to accept it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the paragraph proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment, as I understand, would, in the opinion of the

legislative counsel, in effect, attempt to restrict the courts, which of course Congress cannot do.

However, the amendment I propose provides the following:

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude the payment of an amount for any vessel or the use thereof in any case in which such amount shall have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be just compensation therefor.

In other words, by adopting my amendment we would remove the inference that Congress is trying to prejudge a case which goes to court.

It was the opinion of the legislative counsel that the amendment would put the former order back into effect and at the same time would pass on to the Maritime Commission an expression of the intent of Congress, whereas if we simply struck the House language from the bill, we might not express the congressional intent in connection with the committee proposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine the record, I think he will find that more than a constitutional question is involved; certain practical questions, such as the foreign ownership of ships, are also involved. If a ship has passed into foreign ownership, of course Congress has no further jurisdiction over it, and the owners would obtain whatever benefits they derived by the purchase price paid at the time of sale, whereas the House provision seeks to deprive American citizens of an advantage. For example, suppose a group of Americans organized a corporation under the laws of Panama, and suppose a ship was transferred to Panamanian registry, and thus could not be touched by the United States authorities because it was foreign owned. Yet the ownership actually might be in a group of American citizens who owned the stock of the corporation.

So the proposal adopted by the House, as the committee considered it, was unjust to American citizens in a business sense, although not necessarily raising a question as to their constitutional rights, yet that question also was raised in the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I would agree with the Senator from Arizona on almost all subjects in this connection except that of ship sales. I think it is recognized that ships are always sold by the Government in a period of ship surpluses, following a war, and at that time are sold at greatly reduced prices, and that ships are requisitioned by the Government in a time of war or emergency, and at such times the ships have inflated values. If the Government is going to requisition ships in periods of high prices, and later is going to sell them back to the original owners at bargain prices, the ship companies will continue to make tremendous profits. I stated for the RECORD the other day a case in which a ship was sold for as little as $17,000.

I am perfectly willing to have the Government pay for a ship it subsequently requisitions, following a sale to private owners, what the ship cost the private owners, plus what the new owners have spent on the ship; but I do not think the Government should buy at an inflated price of several million dollars a ship which previously was sold by it as surplus at a very low price. The Comptroller General has called attention to this matter again and again.

I have, from Mr. Warren, a letter which I shall include in the RECORD, in which he points how that happens after a war and how it should be safeguarded against. Unless something is done by Congress to give the Maritime Commission a statement of the congressional intent in this matter, I think the same thing will happen at the next session of Congress.

However, the adoption of my amendment would not preclude a ship company, if it was not satisfied with what the Government was offering, from going to court and establishing its just claim; and if it could establish its claim, there would be nothing wrong with having the adjudicated amount paid.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator's amendment is to be adopted, it will be necessary for the Senate to reverse the committee and to adopt the House language, will it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; but I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that the proper procedure is to offer this amendment first to the House provision, and, if it is adopted, then have the vote taken on the question of adoption of the committee amendment proposing to strike out the House provision with my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. If the Senator will yield further, let me say that if that is done, the Senator's amendment will be offered to the House language as it came to the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator's amendment apply to foreign sales of vessels?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it does not.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to ask this question: Why does the Senator wish to discriminate as between a sale made by a foreign owner and a sale made by an American owner?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no discrimination, so far as that is concerned, Mr. President. The fact that we have given some ships to foreign countries is not something we can change; we cannot take back those vessels unless we go to war about them.

If we are going to consider the feature of discrimination, I grant that there is discrimination today, for if an American citizen goes to his Government and says, "You should furnish me with food and clothes free of charge because you are furnishing them free of charge to citizens of many foreign countries," his own Government will laugh at him; our Government will not furnish those things to its own citizens, even though it is furnishing them to citizens of foreign countries. Any American citizen may come to the Government and say, "You should furnish me bread, wheat, and clothing free of charge, because you are furnishing them to people all over the world free of charge. Why do you discriminate against me, an American citizen?" From the standpoint of the foreign-aid program, everything which has been done by the Congress for the past 10 years has been a discrimination against the American citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that point, but will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the side-slips which are before us, there is set forth the testimony presented by witnesses. On page 40, the testimony of former Senator Ball, who appeared as a witness, is set forth, and I read from it:

Permit me to list briefly the very cogent arguments against this rider and the objectives it seeks to reach:

1. The rider would discriminate against American citizens who purchased ships from the Government in favor of foreign purchasers. That is true because, while this restriction might apply to the American purchaser, there is no way under which it could be applied to the foreigner who bought ships under the 1946 act.

First, let me ask the Senator whether he agrees with that statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would agree with it to the extent that I think the Congress made a terrible mistake in 1946 when it gave these ships to foreign countries. Pursuing the thought further, every country which is a friend of America was discriminated against, in favor of Russia, because Russia has American ships today for which she has never paid a dime. By the same token, if we go further, we should give ships free to all foreign countries and give ships free to American companies. In fact, if we had enough money, we perhaps should give everything we promise free to everybody.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree completely with the statement of the Senator. I think he will remember that the junior Senator from Nebraska tried to prevent the sale of tankers, which we finally gave away, during that very period. But the point now is this: Inasmuch as they have been given away, we require a foreigner to sell his ship in the open market; but we require of an American citizen, even though a ship was practically given or donated to him, that he sell it back at the price he paid for it. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it is not correct. We do not require the foreigner to sell his ship in the open market, because we cannot require the foreigner to do anything—period. But the provision of the House bill does say he shall not buy the ships from American companies at inflated and exorbitant prices.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. But it is the interpretation of the witnesses, and it is my interpretation, that it would

permit the foreigner, who has already obtained a ship, to sell it in the open market for whatever it will bring. Yet this language would prevent the American citizen from doing the same thing. The Senator from Delaware may have any opinion he wants, but, regardless of how the ships were obtained—and I was opposed to giving them away in the first place, yet they have been given away—does the Senator want to write legislation which restricts an American citizen and discriminates against him, as compared to the foreign citizen who has already purchased a ship, or who has received it as a gratuity, and who may sell it in the open market for whatever the ship will bring?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me make a suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is in truth and in fact a legislative matter. It ought to be passed upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, both of the House and of the Senate. That is the way to legislate. The House provision actually changes the law. That was the basic reason for the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee striking the language from the bill, as we felt we were not qualified to pass upon the question. We would much prefer to have the legislative committee handle it.

If, when the bill goes to conference, we cannot persuade the House to follow that course, we shall at least have the advantage of having placed in the RECORD the language suggested by the Senator from Delaware. But, in all good conscience, I do not feel that I can agree that the action taken by the committee should be reversed, because, in truth and in fact, the provision of the House bill stricken out by the committee is legislation, which ought to be handled by a legislative committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated May 4, 1951, signed by the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, addressed to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 4, 1951.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of today requests my comments on the following provision carried in the appropriation for maritime activities of the Department of Commerce on pages 49 and 50 of the independent offices appropriation bill, 1952, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations:

"No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions."

An identical provision was included in the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1951, H. R. 3587, as passed by the House, but was stricken from the bill when reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. That provision was submitted by the Maritime Administrator at the request of your subcommittee in order to apply to all cases of vessels sold by the United States, and later reacquired by the Government, the principles of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, limiting the amount to be paid by the United States through purchase or requisition for vessels on which a construction-differential subsidy was paid. I am aware that the provisions of section 802 require the limitation on the price to be paid by the United States in event of reacquisitions to be written into contracts executed by the former Maritime Commission, whereas many of the vessels to which the presently proposed limitation might apply were acquired from the Government without such provisions in the contracts. Thus, the present limitation represents a belated attempt to remedy what I have felt was a basic defect in the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Notwithstanding the potential legal and constitutional questions which might be raised, it is a laudable effort to conserve the taxpayers' funds in a field where past history has shown that the interests of the Government have suffered in transactions involving the disposal of ships by the Government at depressed prices and the later payment by the Government for acquisition, charter, or loss of the same vessels at much higher prices.

Times does not permit the ascertainment of the aggregate amounts involved in such cases. Certain of those cases were referred to by you on the floor of the House yesterday. Others have been the subject of reports to the Congress by the General Accounting Office incident to its examinations of the accounts and records of the former Maritime Commission.

The following two cases are representative of what has happened in the past and what will happen again unless some limitation can be established on the amounts to be paid by the Government upon reacquisition of vessels previously disposed of by it.

"The first company purchased 23 vessels built by the Government during 1919, 1920, and 1921, at an estimated cost to the Government of $41,421,000. The company's cost of acquisition was $1,570,000. The book value of the vessels at December 31, 1941, was $982,000, and the former Maritime Commission's estimated world market value at December 31, 1938, was $2,170,000. The Commission chartered all these vessels for varying periods during World War II and paid effective bareboat charter hire of $7,162,000. Ten of the vessels were sunk, and for those 10 vessels the owner received insurance of approximately $4,910,000, most of which was paid by the Government. Two of the vessels were requisitioned for title in 1945 for $640,000. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $1,570,000, was $12,712,000."

Following World War II, the same company bought 26 vessels, most of which were built in 1944. The cost to the Government was $74,835,000, of which $3,434,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $24,720,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,056,000, leaving a net recovery to the Government of $23,664,000.

The second company acquired nine vessels built in 1919 and 1920, at a cost to the Government of $13,739,000. Those vessels cost the company $529,000. Their book value at December 31, 1941, was $343,000, and the former Maritime Commission's world market value December 31, 1938, was $755,000. All nine vessels were chartered to the Government during World War II and effective bareboat charter hire of $1,707,000 was paid by the Government. In addition, the owner collected insurance of $2,852,000, most of which was paid by the Government, for five of the vessels which were sunk, and $789,000 for two of the vessels requisitioned for title by the Government in 1944 and 1945. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $529,000, was $5,348,000.

This second company after World War II bought seven vessels built in 1944 and 1945, at a cost to the Government of $32,034,000, of which $10,276,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $7,513,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,797,000, leaving a net recovery by the Government of $5,716,000.

It should be emphasized that the foregoing cases are not isolated ones. However, they should be sufficient to indicate that the Government, which inevitably sells its vessels in a buyer's market and buys them in a seller's market, needs every legitimate means to minimize the resulting financial disadvantages.

Naturally, representatives of those interests which would be affected by the operation of the proposed limitation have argued strongly against it. They have raised doubts in the minds of conscientious legislators who have expressed these doubts in debate. It is fully recognized that the provision, while binding on the Maritime Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the General Accounting Office, would be open to construction in court actions. Concerning the constitutional point of just compensation, I can only restate the traditional position of the General Accounting Office—and to my mind the only sound position that can be taken by the Office—that it does not exist to question the constitutionality, but to carry out faithfully the mandates of legislation enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to read for the benefit of Senators two paragraphs of this letter, which point out the condition to which Mr. Warren calls attention and which he is trying to prevent happening again. He says:

The following two cases are representative of what has happened in the past and what will happen again unless some limitation can be established on the amounts to be paid by the Government upon reaquisition of vessels previously disposed of by it.

He cites two examples:

The first company purchased 23 vessels built by the Government during 1919, 1920, and 1921, at an estimated cost to the Government of $41,421,000. The company's cost of acquisition was $1,570,000. The book value of the vessels at December 31, 1941, was $982,000, and the former Maritime Commission's estimated world market value at December 31, 1938, was $2,170,000. The Commission chartered all these vessels for varying periods during World War II and paid effective bareboat charter hire of $7,162,000. Ten of the vessels were sunk, and for those 10 vessels the owner received insurance of approximately $4,910,000, most of which was paid by the Government. Two of the vessels were requisitioned for title in 1945 for $640,000. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $1,570,000, was $12,712,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no doubt at all that the Comptroller General is correct in that statement, but the point is, it is a matter which ought to be handled by a legislative committee in order that all the equities may be fully developed. It is not a matter which should be acted on precipitately by the House Committee on Appropriations and again by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and then by the respective Houses themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is a legislative body, and I think it very appropriate that we should act on it at this time.

Mr. Warren continued, in reference to this same company which, during World War II, received $12,712,000 for ships for which it had paid $1,570,000, when it purchased them from the Government:

Following World War II, the same company bought 26 vessels, most of which were built in 1944. The cost to the Government was $74,835,000, of which $3,434,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $24,720,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,056,000, leaving a net recovery to the Government of $23,664,000.

What is attempted to be done through this measure is to prevent that same company, now, at a time when the country is confronted with a wartime need for these ships, from selling them back to the Government at a price inflated many times more than what the company paid. We retain the ships through the emergency and then sell them as surplus back to the company. An attempt is made to break that up by the provision in the House bill which the committee proposes to strike out.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with what the Senator is attempting to do, and I would like to see it done, but I want to say that, really, what he is doing, is not for the future. What he is doing is to add a legislative rider, which in effect is an attempt to enact ex post facto legislation, going back 5 years, and writing a condition in the sale of a vessel, which the Congress refused to write.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I was here when we voted on it. I was against giving away these ships. But the condition was not written into the law at the time. We are now asked to pass legislation which would actually place in the law retroactively a condition with respect to the sale of the vessels. There is no condition with respect to the vessels which were sold to foreigners. What is actually being attempted now is to require an American who bought a ship to sell it back to the Government at the original sales price plus the cost of improvements. It is impossible to compel a foreigner to do that. He cannot be brought into court, or be compelled to comply with this provision of the bill. It would actually represent a discrimination against American shipowners, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In answer to that, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska as I said before, everything which has been done by the Congress during the last few years has been a discrimination against American citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I agree with that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have given free goods to countries throughout the world, and charged it to the American people.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no argument about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. American citizens are not only paying for what we give to the rest of the world, but for what is given away here, under legislation, which has been enacted to hold down prices. The Government is going out into world markets and buying at inflated prices, which are higher than those it could buy for in the American market. Surely there is discrimination against the American citizens. For some unknown reason, there has been a theory that an American citizen is the last fellow we are supposed to recognize.

What we are getting here is discrimination against shipowners. They are not told that they have to sell the ships, they are merely told that if they do they will not be given an excessive wartime price, as they could be if this provision were not included in the bill. The Government, confronted as it is with a war emergency, must have ships, even if it has to pay $10,000,000, $15,000,000, or $20,000,000 apiece for them. I do not think any company should have the right to take advantage of their own government in a wartime period. My reason for offering this amendment is, we are advised that, if it is not included, the House provision would be interpreted by the legislative counsel as unconstitutional, and would therefore have to be stricken out. I feel that the amendment which I have offered should be adopted and taken to conference, to see whether we cannot work out something there which will be along this line.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in complete accord with the suggested procedure. In fact, I raised the question a moment ago. We have a perfect right to do it. I agree with the argument of the Senator, but I add that when these vessels were sold it was without conditions. They were sold as clean as a ribbon. That is what happened over the protest of many Members of the Senate. That is when we gave the vessels away.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In November of last year we gave some away, and we are still giving them away.

Mr. WHERRY. Not with my agreement. We are now writing ex post facto a provision which should have been in the conditional sale of the vessels themselves. If a foreigner desires to sell a vessel which he received gratuitously, or nearly so, he does not have to do the same thing the American has to do. I understand what the Senator means, and there is a great deal of merit in his statement. I should like to make the foreigners do just what is required of Americans; but that cannot be accomplished, because we cannot get them into court.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator to a certain point, but we are perfectly within our rights in passing legislation today which would prohibit taking these ships back at wartime inflated prices. I think we can stop the purchase by our Government of these ships at inflated prices. If the Government buys them at inflated prices, the time will come when it will be selling them back at lower prices. Many persons have to give up some of their freedom in wartime. In my opinion the ship companies do not have any great reason to complain. We are taking away the privileges of the boys whom we draft into the services.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make a suggestion. Why not accept the amendment and take it to conference? It has been debated a number of times, and we have suffered a number of times because of the very situation which now exists.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I understand the proposal of the Senator from Delaware is that the Senate agree to the action taken by the House, so far as it goes, and then add a provision to it. My thought is that the Senate disagrees to the House provision. We will have the proposal to take to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it can be worked out from a parliamentary standpoint, the provision could be taken to conference. I am willing to try to work it out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the amendment being offered as a substitute for the House provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was advised to offer the amendment as an amendment to the House language.

Mr. WHERRY. Then we would have the House language agreed to, and the only thing is——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it be better to offer this amendment and let the Senate vote on the committee amendment separately? Can that be done so that all this material can be in the conference?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Oregon has a suggestion that he wishes to make at this time, I ask unanimous consent that we pass over the amendment temporarily, and see whether the paragraph can be rewritten and couched in different language.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest leaving the House language stricken and substitute for it the provision which the Senator from Delaware has rewritten, to provide the legal effect of what he has in mind in his amendment, that no ship shall be taken except by seizure, the compensation to be determined by a court. That is exactly what is being done. Then both provisions would be in the conference and a determination could be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it be in order to offer the substance of my amendment in place of the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the point I want to be sure about is that the House language would still remain in the bill so that we would have the entire subject matter in conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, the House language will be in conference automatically, no matter what the Senate does. If I offer my amendment in substitution for the House language and it is agreed to, both provisions will be in conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then the procedure would be to agree to the committee amendment and add thereto the text now proposed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment, which I understand would be stricken; but I am offering it with the understanding that I am not disapproving the committee amendment, but in order to get all the subject matter before the conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the print of the bill which will go to conference the House language will be stricken and the language of the Senator's amendment will appear in italics.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator is now offering his amendment as a substitute?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In addition to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IX—Department of Defense—Civil functions, Department of the the Army—Corps of Engineers," on page 19, in line 14, in the subhead, to strike out "Niagara Power Development" and insert "Niagara Redevelopment Remedial Works Investigation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading "Chapter X—Funds appropriated to the President—International children's welfare work", on page 20, line 7, after the word "work", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000.'"

THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, since last Thursday, when General MacArthur began his testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, I imagine few Senators have had an opportunity to visit their States and talk to their constituents.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I imagine the Senator is going to speak on a subject other than the appropriation bill. Can the Senator advise us how long he may speak?

Mr. BENTON. About 45 minutes, unless there are questions and interruptions.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit of a few days in Connecticut, where I have had an opportunity to talk to several hundred of my constituents. The one thing which impressed me most in connection with my visit was the intense interest evidenced by citizens, in all walks of life, in the so-called MacArthur issue. Everyone wants to know, what does all this mean? Where are we going? What is the nature of the MacArthur conflict which has occasioned such dissension among the country's political leaders?

Last night, in Middletown, Conn., where I spoke to the chamber of commerce, I was preceded by a talented quartette from Wesleyan University. The crowd applauded when the toastmaster asked the quartette to sing Old Soldiers Never Die. At my first mention of General MacArthur's name the crowd applauded General MacArthur. At the end of my talk, the largely Republican audience seemed grateful to me for the care and candor with which I had addressed them. They complimented me by rising as they applauded, and I discovered from that reaction, I think, one thing that is now wanted by our constituents. They ask for a frank and fearless facing up by their Senators, as rapidly as we can, to grave issues which are currently being presented in the testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees.

On the basis of the spontaneous reaction of the Chamber of Commerce of Middletown, I decided today—out of my own background in the field of foreign policy, without any consultation with anyone in any Government department and without any guidance or suggestion from anyone in Government—I decided to talk about General MacArthur and his testimony. I do not think his testimony has yet been discussed at any length whatever on the floor of the Senate.

General MacArthur's recommendations involve the future of every citizen of our country, and, indeed, of all citizens of all free countries. Our constituents, judging by my 4 days of observations in Connecticut, hope that we will weigh each side of the argument carefully and dispassionately. They hope that we will be able to bring to our consideration the cold objectivity of a coin dealer, who weighs his gold coin gently, while inspecting both sides of it to check and study it for value, age, and intrinsic worth.

I have attended two sessions of the hearings, the opening one last Thursday and the other that of this morning. Mr. President, it seems to me that the hearings are being conducted most remarkably by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Indeed, the Senators who are present seem to view themselves somewhat in the role of judges—surely seem to be approaching the grave questions posed with every effort at impartiality.

I wish that all our citizens could themselves do what they seem to expect from us Senators. Of course, the hearings have not been concluded. There is still a great deal of testimony to be heard. Perhaps by the end of the hearings I may not still feel we have set such good examples.

As I walked to the hearing today with a member of one of the committees which are hearing the testimony he expressed surprise that I should be willing to speak on General MacArthur's testimony before the remainder of the evidence has been given. But I have read carefully the testimony given by General MacArthur as well as yesterday's testimony by General Marshall, our Secretary of Defense, with whom I served in the Department of State. And may I interrupt myself to comment that surely General Marshall is one of the noblest leaders we have ever had, and certainly his patriotism and loyalty are, and always have been, beyond reproach.

As I read the 4 days of testimony it seemed to me that the basic outline is beginning to form, and to form clearly. I at least feel that I have now heard enough to see how the basic issues will develop and how sharply drawn they will be.

General Eichelberger, as commander of the military government unit in Japan, implemented General MacArthur's policies in Japan for 3 years. He was commander of the Eighth Army in the Far East for 4 years, after a brilliant record as a combat general during World War II.

In World War I he was chief of intelligence to General Graves in Russia. He has spent 9 years in Japan, China, Siberia, and elsewhere in the Far East, and was chief of G-2 on China here in Washington for 4 years. By experience and judgment, General Eichelberger qualifies as one of the leading American authorities on the Orient, and I feel, therefore, that his views in this column are pertinent to the great debate now in progress over the best method of bringing the Korean War to a close and averting a new general war.

There being no objection, the article from Newsweek was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE BOMB MANCHURIA?—VIEW OF A TOP AUTHORITY

(By Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, U. S. Army, retired)

(The most immediate point in the great debate on American policy in the Far East is whether the United States should bomb Communist bases in Manchuria. Newsweek here presents the views of a top authority. General Eichelberger was formerly second-in-command to Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Japan.)

Since the Chinese intervention in Korea last fall, it has been my fixed conviction that Mao Tse-tung must have received certain promises from Stalin before committing his troops against the United Nations in Korea. In the last analysis, Mao was entering an undeclared war against the United States. It is hard to believe that he would have taken such a step unless assured of Russian support should the conflict be broadened beyond Korea.

We don't know what commitments the Soviets have made to Mao, but we do know that they are in a position to give the Chinese support—disguised or otherwise—with air power, with submarines, and with troops. And we do know that the treaty of mutual support between China and Russia can be invoked to provide a legal basis for such support. So far, however, the Russians seem to have been reluctant to supply much aid to the Chinese, except for the Soviet-built planes which dart across the Yalu and back again. The Chinese ground forces apparently have little or no Soviet equipment. But the appearance of Russian tanks in the ground fighting could make a great difference and the intervention of Red planes over the battlefield and of Red submarines against our supply lines could be decisive.

What action on our part would bring about Russian intervention? It is my belief that bombing the Red bases in the "privileged sanctuary" of Manchuria would cause the Soviets to enter the war in Korea and that this would also probably herald the beginning of the third world war. Certainly preparations are being made, not only for defending Manchurian bases, but also for putting a Red air force in Korea. This is proved by the construction and improvement of airfields all over Northern Korea.

What would be the effect of Soviet air intervention only (leaving out of consideration the submarines and ground forces)? First, take the lads doing the fighting. No doubt they resent the fact that we are not able to bomb across the Yalu and hit the enemy where he comes from. But, at the same time, these lads have been spared being bombed and strafed as they fight against superior numbers. Since December our battle losses have been consistently lower than those of the enemy with consequent improvement in all ranks in immediate battle contact. All this might be reversed if the enemy had air support.

Second, take the effect of Soviet intervention against our own privileged sanctuary—Japan. Throughout the Korean War the Japanese have realized all too well that we have been fighting their fight across the Sea of Japan. They have natural fears inspired by the presence of powerful Red forces on the island of Sakhalin and on the Asiatic mainland. Most Japanese now hope for an early peace treaty, including the right of rearming ground forces for the defense of their own shores. The Japanese need time, above all, to build their defenses on land and to coordinate them with the air and sea defenses which we will provide.

Third, take the matter of time itself. Is it on our side? A few days ago it was my privilege to visit the plant where the world's fastest global bomber is made. I left with the hope that we can hold off the third world war by every legitimate means until that assembly line and a hundred others can produce the war material which will deter the gentlemen of the Kremlin from total war or spell defeat for them if they force war upon us.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE AND PASSAGE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

During the delivery of Mr. BENTON'S speech,

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request, but before doing so I ask that the proceedings now taking place in the Senate may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following the speech of the able Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, last Friday the Senate passed on the calendar call Senate Joint Resolution 50, a joint resolution to provide for the continuation of authority for regulation of exports. This resolution merely extends present authority to control exports from June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1953.

I may say that the joint resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and was passed unanimously by the Senate.

An identical measure was passed by the House as House Joint Resolution 197 on April 17 and was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the time that committee was preparing to report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 50.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 197 and that House Joint Resolution 197 be considered and passed by the Senate. I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the action by which it passed Senate Joint Resolution 50 and that Senate Joint Resolution 50 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from South Carolina if the joint resolution to which he now refers is the one concerning which the distinguished Senator from Kansas spoke to me the other day?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Banking and Currency will be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 197.

Without objection, the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 50 was passed will be reconsidered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 197) to provide for the continuation of authority for regulation of exports was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 50 is indefinitely postponed.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that certain routine nominations in the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, which have been unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee, totaling 1,563 officers, may be confirmed and the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 136) allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma,

I asked that the item on page 12, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, be temporarily passed over. If agreeable to the Senate, we could recur to that amendment now, and if the Senator from Oklahoma has any amendment to offer to it he could offer it and get it out of the way.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Arizona, I desire to call up an amendment to the committee amendment on page 12, after line 9. The amendment to the amendment is offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, for himself, and on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Arizona, I understand, requests that a certain amendment on page 12 be considered. I should like to be heard on that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment to the amendment first be read by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 12, line 15, it is proposed by Mr. KERR to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WELKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECRETARY MARSHALL'S TESTIMONY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this morning I attended the hearings before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, sitting jointly, and heard, I think, the most intelligent and the most intelligible examination of a witness that I have ever had the pleasure of hearing. The examination was conducted by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I think the questions which he asked point up the issue with which we are faced, better, perhaps, than anything else that has been heard. Rather than having the questions and answers buried in the hearings, they should be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the questions asked by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the answers made by Secretary Marshall.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator GEORGE, do you desire to conduct your examination now?

Senator GEORGE. I am not going to ask a lot of questions, but I will ask the general some questions. I think it will take 15 or 20 or 25 minutes maybe, but if you are going to quit for the day——

Chairman RUSSELL. I am trying to ascertain the pleasure of the committee. You are next in order.

Chairman CONNALLY. I think we could run on for a half hour until 1 o'clock.

Senator GEORGE. I have no business on the floor, but a conference.

Senator FULBRIGHT. We ran until 1 yesterday.

Chairman RUSSELL. Suppose we proceed and see how far we get here.

Senator GEORGE. Is Senator BRIDGES finished?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator GEORGE. General Marshall, you went in as Secretary of Defense in September, but may I ask if there is in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, your Department, any estimate of the number of troops that would be required of us in Korea after the decision or when the decision was made that we would go into Korea to repel the invasion of Southern Korea by the North Koreans?

Secretary MARSHALL. Senator, there are successive messages in response to General MacArthur's recommendations as to the number of divisions they would have to have, and that would be increased if the situation changes.

Senator GEORGE. I meant at the time we decided to go in, general.

Secretary MARSHALL. I don't know about that, sir; I will have to look it up.

Senator GEORGE. If there is an estimate there of the troops that would be required, and if it meets with the pleasure of the chairman and the committee, I would be glad for you to direct me where I can get it.

Secretary MARSHALL. I will find out about that, sir.

Senator GEORGE. In your Department. Yes, sir.

Was there also an estimate furnished the President at the time of our ability to adequately support the troops that we were committing in Korea, both in manpower and matériel of war? Could you say whether that estimate was made, and if so, I would be very glad if you could get that for us.

Secretary MARSHALL. I will endeavor to get that, Senator, but I might say, Senator, those questions might be answered very directly by the Chiefs of Staff, who have all the data and are cognizant of what exists and what does not.

Senator GEORGE. Yes. But, of course, I know that the estimate may have varied from time to time, but I am speaking now of the entry into Korea.

Secretary MARSHALL. You are talking about the initial estimates.

Senator GEORGE. What did you say?

Secretary MARSHALL. You are talking about the initial estimates.

Senator GEORGE. The initial estimates; yes, sir; and not only of the number of troops then required, but an estimate of our ability and capacity to adequately support those troops by additional manpower and implements of war.

Secretary MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator GEORGE. General, you referred to the time that you visited China. That was in 1945, was it not?

Secretary MARSHALL. I arrived in China a few days before Christmas, 1945; yes, sir.

Senator GEORGE. You were there almost a year?

Secretary MARSHALL. I was there until the following January, a year later, January 1947, with the exception of a period, I think, of 5 weeks, in March and April of 1946.

Senator GEORGE. Now, General, did you not come back with a rather definite impression that in order to successfully organize or reorganize the Chinese Nationalist Government, it would be necessary to bring about a coalition of the Communists with the Nationalist group in power?

Secretary MARSHALL. Would you state the first part of you question again please, Senator?

Chairman RUSSELL. The reporter I think has it right there where he can read it back.

(The reporter read back the last question.)

Secretary MARSHALL. First, Senator, I will have to turn to the word "coalition." I went over, very hurriedly of course, and in studying the various policy directives, public statements from this Government and the conditions over there, I came to the conclusion very early that two things had to happen.

One was that there should be a normal democratic form of government, that is with the minority as well as the majority actions and representations in whatever legislative group they had.

The use of the word "coalition" as relating to cabinet coalition was another matter because I gradually reached the feeling that it was practically impossible for the Nationalist Government cabinet appointees to work in any degree of harmony, as a matter of fact to work other than with great bitterness constantly of any other members of that cabinet group that came from the Communist Party.

The temporizing proposal involved there by their own initiative, that is the Kuomintang government, the Communist group and this minority party group was sort of an over-all council wherein the dominant party, the only party really that had any representation in the legislative assembly, was to have 40 members and all the other groups combined were to have 40, but its action could be vetoed by the generalissimo, and that veto could only be overridden by a two-thirds vote, which meant that defections would have to be from his own group before he could be countered in his action by veto.

Now that was the only approach to a coalition, it seemed to me, that had any possibility of working. They would have a long way to go even legislatively because the bitternesses were so great, they were founded on so many years of contest and also the resistance of those that were members of the government by a long period of years of exclusive authority had become great to the point it was seemingly almost impossible to cut their power. So when you speak of coalition, I would feel that you have to define between that and a two-party government and a three-party government, any way members of the legislative assembly which represented other parties, which was not the case at the time I was there, because the ruling action in China at that time was the group, the top-level group, which included military leaders, civil authorities and others which actually made the laws themselves, and that was the equivalent under their particular form of a national committee here, the Generalissimo deriving his authority from being chairman of that national committee. That overrode everything else.

The great problem was how you could reduce these animosities, this complete distrust on both sides.

There was in between various minor groups, notably the Democratic League I believe they called it, which lined up with the Communists, and the Young China

have had a lack of realistic appreciation of what was happening in connection with our Berlin blockade before we got it established. Others thought we should go right in and smash our way through. We were not being realistic. That word was used in the criticism of what we were aiming to do. I think we were realistic, and I think we avoided a tragic consequence.

Senator GEORGE. I have no word of criticism to offer on that point.

Secretary MARSHALL. I am talking about the realistic approach, Senator.

Senator GEORGE. Yes.

Secretary MARSHALL. And you have referred to my being a soldier, which I was. But every reaction of a soldier is to hit back, counter immediately and destroy the enemy, all the enemy's possibilities for build up of his strength and execution of his plans. But here is a case where we have a great many other factors we have to consider, and I think they are very important considerations.

Senator GEORGE. I grant you that, General. I am not overlooking or leaving out of mind the other factors—our allies, their viewpoints, and all of that. But I am speaking of the Korean thing directly and almost only at this moment.

I think you would agree, would you not, that it is pretty hard to win the purely defensive war in a narrow area like the Korean Peninsula, particularly if your enemy may immunize himself from your shot by merely going across the river and there rebuilding his forces?

Secretary MARSHALL. I would answer that reference to past history, by saying it is very difficult to win on a defensive basis. It is very reckless when you are under strength to plunge in on an aggressive offensive procedure. There have been some notable defensive campaigns in history which have ended in an offensive and decisive action.

I will say notably one was the peninsula campaign under Wellington. He endured for quite a period of time. His campaign was measured in years, largely, almost entirely for long periods on the defensive. Of course, Torres Vedras lines are famous in history. In the end he really played a leading part in the complete upset of the Napoleonic regime. He had to start on a defensive basis, he had no other choice. We have had to start on a defensive basis because we have really no other choice.

However, we are discussing one phase where we have a choice, which is the use of our air power and our naval power. And I think in regard to them I am just repeating myself time and again on the same issue.

Senator GEORGE. Yes, I understand. I don't care to occasion that, General.

I have no further questions, and I thank you very much.

Chairman RUSSELL. In view of the time, I assume we had best recess here now, and if there is no objection we will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon at 1:10 p. m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a. m. Wednesday, May 9, 1951.)

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a little over a year ago I brought to the attention of the Senate the names of a number of individuals whom I considered dangerous to the Nation. I should like to make an interim report on one of those individuals as of today.

At that time I pointed out that one Esther Caukins Brunauer, who was holding a top job in the State Department. I pointed out that the evidence showed that her husband had been a member of the Communist Party and was active therein, that she belonged to a number of Communist-front organizations, and that she was one of Alger Hiss' assistants at San Francisco.

Incidentally, her assistance to Hiss has since been denied by her, but on page 419 of this State Department publication we find that Brunauer was one of the assistants of Hiss. Before proceeding on the report on this case, Mr. President, I should like to read very, very briefly from a few questions and answers in the record at the time of the hearings before the unlamented Tydings committee.

Senator HICKENLOOPER was interrogating Mrs. Brunauer:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe you testified that your husband some years ago was in fact a Communist, but after a short time in this country he ceased his association with the Communist Party.

Incidentally, I may say that her husband at that time was one of the explosives experts working with the Navy, holding a top job handling topmost secrets. He had been cleared in 1945 for the Manhattan project, and he had been cleared also for the Bikini bomb test.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. Yes—his association with the Communist movement. He was never a member of the Communist Party.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You make the positive statement that he never was a member of the Communist Party in this country?

Mrs. BRUNAUER. I make that statement; yes, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I do not want to be unfair about this question, but I believe in those years of which you are making this very positive statement now you were not even acquainted with him, so I assume you make your statement based upon what he has told you.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. I make that statement based upon what he has told me, and in the first years that he was in Washington, when he occasionally saw some individuals whom he had known previously, his connections were just as I have stated, as a member of the Young Workers League. The Young Workers League was organized and run by the Communist Party. There is no attempt to deny that my husband for a short time supported the Communist ideals.

Later Senator HICKENLOOPER asked Mrs. Brunauer:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did the Communist Party or the Hungarian delegation to UNESCO visit you or your husband or your home a few years ago on his way from Mexico?

Mrs. BRUNAUER. He called on my husband and I would be glad to give you what I know of that, if you wish, or, if you prefer, it can wait until my husband comes before you.

The husband was there, but he was never put on the stand.

Mr. President, at the time I gave the case of Mrs. Brunauer to the committee I asked the committee to hear me in executive session with respect to Stephen Brunauer. I pointed to the kind of work he was doing, and I explained to the chairman that I could not discuss in public the evidence which we had against him without endangering our security. The committee refused to hear the evidence. Since that time much damage has been done, before the Navy finally took action. For example, his very good friend, Noel Field, a known Communist and espionage agent, spent night after night with Stephen Brunauer, who had access to all the top secrets in the explosives section of our Navy. Field then left the country, and has since disappeared behind the iron curtain, taking with him all the information which his friend Brunauer had given him. The Navy finally took action. The action by the Navy was not based upon the evidence which we had last year. At least the action was not based solely on such evidence. What forced the Navy to take action was that it appeared during the atomic-spy investigations that Stephen Brunauer was involved. The Navy rightly suspended him and gave him 30 days in which to answer charges. His wife, Esther Brunauer, was suspended from her job in the State Department, where she had access to top-secret material.

Incidentally, as a member of UNESCO she has been able to travel rather freely to other capitals of the world. The evidence shows contacts in those capitals with members of Communist delegations.

Tremendous pressure is now being applied by the State Department to the Navy to reinstate Stephen Brunauer. Let me give Senators the argument which is being made in that respect. The argument which is being advanced by the State Department is this. They say, "Yes, we admit that he is involved with agents of the Kremlin. However, if he is discharged he is such an outstanding man in explosives he will leave this country and undoubtedly disappear behind the iron curtain and work for the Soviet. "For that reason," they say, "put him back in top secret work in this country and we will put him under close surveillance." They also say that when this is done Esther Brunauer will be put back in the State Department with access to top-secret material again.

Mr. President, I believe the subject should be brought to the attention of the Senate so that we shall be able to watch developments in the case. How much damage was done since Noel Field, who acted as a courier, left the country and disappeared behind the iron curtain cannot be known. How many American boys have died or will die because of this man's having access to top secrets, no one knows. I do want everyone to know that even though it is conceded now by the group in the State Department—and by that I mean the Acheson group—that he is dangerous and that he is or was involved with agents of the Kremlin, and even though it is known that he was a member of the party, there is this tremendous pressure being exerted to reinstate him in his job.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. Two amendments were made to the bill, one of which was an amendment offered in committee by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], relative to the expiration of the act, which amendment was accepted by the conferees; the other, an amendment relative to the removal of the tariff on cordage or binder twine, I believe it is called. That amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the distingushed Senator said "binder twine." It related, not to binder twine, but to baler twine.

Mr. GEORGE. I should have said baler twine.

Mr. THYE. Binder twine is exempted, and it was our endeavor to exempt baler twine in the same manner that binder twine is now exempted.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct. I merely wish to say that the latter amendment was rejected by the House conferees, who presented in support of their action a statement that they had already agreed to give certain interested parties a hearing on a bill embodying this particular amendment. The hearings had been scheduled, or would be scheduled in the immediate future, and they expected to finish their work on the bill and to act upon it at a very early date. They thought it would be completed within the next 30 days. That amendment was therefore eliminated. Those were the only two amendments to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I was called from the Senate Chamber for a moment to answer a telephone call. The Senator, I take it, is speaking of a baler-twine amendment, on which the Members of the House had promised to conduct hearings; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], was, I think, the sponsor or one of the cosponsors of the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. He was a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. WHERRY. Is the conference report satisfactory to those Senators?

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that on this amendment the House found itself in a position where its own conferees had promised to conduct hearings and had notified parties to that effect. They would naturally be embarrassed if the amendment were acted on without their having lived up to that promise. So they said they would conduct hearings on the bill and would act on it within the next few days.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Will it be necessary for the Senate committee to hold hearings, or may we have the assurance of the able chairman now that he would recommend that the Senate act on the amendment in the form of a bill, in order that we might have it ready by the time the House acted on the same question?

Mr. GEORGE. I can give this assurance to the Senator, that inasmuch as the House is to have hearings, at which all the interested parties are to be heard, we would not duplicate the hearings in the Senate, but would act upon the bill as soon as it came to the Senate, assuming that the House passed the bill.

Mr. THYE. I thank the chairman for that explanation.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to have this explanation by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I know there is intense interest in the baler-twine amendment, and that it is of vital interest to the people of the Middle West. I trust the hearings will be held in the House, and that we may have speedy action.

Mr. GEORGE. We had that assurance. We also had assurance that even the members of the conference were not opposing the amendment for lack of merit, but they had made this definite promise, and it seemed only fair that they give everyone who desired to be heard an opportunity to testify on it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who is attempting to represent constituents who are interested vitally in this subject, I think it is very fair that the matter be handled in that way, because what they wanted was an opportunity to be heard. If their case is not a good one, that would be another matter; they will at least have had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. GEORGE. It was so understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment beginning in line 10, page 12.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Washington in support of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators to the item having relation to the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Several other Senators are interested in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I wonder whether he would be willing to let the amendment go over until tomorrow. If so, we could proceed with other amendments this afternoon. It is my understanding that the Senate will recess at 5 o'clock.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would be glad to do so, with the understanding that he will have an opportunity tomorrow to have the amendment acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand correctly that the distinguished Senator from Arizona has indicated that the bill will be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 12, beginning in line 10, and the amendment to it proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], for himself and other Senators, will be passed over.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that the statement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be printed in the RECORD at this point?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, IN SUPPORT OF ADDITIONAL $100,000,000 TO CARRY OUT THE PURPOSES OF PUBLIC LAW 815—KERR AMENDMENT TO 1951 THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The Federal Government has a particular responsibility to certain school districts throughout the country. The Congress recognized this responsibility and gave effect to it by enacting last year the so-called school construction and school operation and maintenance bills.

The legislation we enacted contained usable yardsticks to measure the extent of

Federal responsibility in each of those school districts where Federal activity within or near its boundaries contributes to the district's financial problems. When the bills, which became Public Laws 815 and 874, were before the Congress, carefully computed cost estimates were presented by the executive branch. At the time we authorized expenditure of Federal funds for school construction and operation and maintenance, the Congress, therefore, knew the approximate yearly cost of its action.

Comes now the time when we must appropriate funds to implement the program we approved last year. In my judgment, we would be less than fair with over 1,000 school districts in this country if we now fudge on them by appropriating less than the amount required to meet their legitimate minimum expectations.

I have a special interest in this question for two reasons: First, the State of Washington has more school districts affected by Federal activity than any State in the Union except Texas and, collectively, those districts are entitled to more Federal assistance under Public Law 815 than any State with the exception of California. Second, I sponsored one of the first bills introduced in the Senate to provide Federal assistance for schools overburdened by Federal activity. Many of the provisions of that bill were later incorporated in legislation on school construction passed by the Senate—legislation on which I was a cosponsor.

Sixty-four school districts in the State of Washington have applied for assistance under Public Law 815, the school-construction bill. It is probable that others will apply and will be found eligible for some help. Collectively the Washington State school districts applying for assistance are entitled to approximately $33,000,000 of Federal aid. Their applications, however, represent projects with a total construction cost of about $29,000,000. To finance these projects, the Federal responsibility—as determined by the yardstick incorporated in Public Law 815—is approximately $19,000,000. The remaining $10,000,000 will come from local sources.

Nation-wide school districts affected in a significant degree by Federal activity are entitled to $322,000,000 Federal aid. Projects already proposed by these districts affected represent a Federal responsibility of over $182,000,000. In addition to this, there is immediate need for construction of school facilities on Federal property estimated to cost $51,000,000, and need for temporary school facilities costing $7,000,000. The total immediate requirement is approximately $240,000,000 Nation-wide.

If we visualize this sum—$240,000,000—as an entry on the liability side of the ledger, and funds to meet it as entries on the debit side, we get the following picture.

Last year Congress appropriated $46,500,000 for school construction. The regular 1953 budget sent up by the President contains a request for $50,000,000. A special deficiency recommendation has been presented to us asking for another $50,000,000. This gives us a proposed $146,500,000 with which to meet a $240,000,000 Federal responsibility to school districts seriously affected by Federal activity.

Mr. President, the school districts of which we are speaking were led to believe that Congress would meet in full the obligation it undertook when it passed Public Law 815. Their confidence in our good faith will be sorely shaken if we now try to settle a $240,000,000 Federal responsibility with a $146,500,000 appropriation.

If the appropriation for school construction is left at the $50,000,000 level recommended by the committee, only 10 schools in the State of Washington will receive the support to which they are entitled. By increasing the amount to the $100,000,000 figure as recommended by the senior Senator from Oklahoma an additional 26 schools will be reached. Even then, some districts in the State of Washington entitled to Federal assistance will have to wait another year.

Every Member of the Senate has stated at one time or another his conviction that schools of America are a keystone in the democratic system. At one time or another, every member of this committee has confirmed his belief in a great principle enunciated by Thomas Jefferson—namely, that we achieve and maintain liberty through literacy.

Literacy today means far more than the ability to read and write. It means the ability to understand the great economic, political, and social problems with which we and the world are confronted.

Mr. President, it costs money to maintain liberty—it costs money to achieve an acceptable level of literacy. I urge favorable action on the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask there be incorporated as part of my remarks a tabulation showing the Washington State school district that would participate in a $50,000,000 appropriation, and those additional schools that would be reached by the adoption of the Kerr amendment.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

A deficiency appropriation of $50,000,000 is required to make partial allotments to applicants with a tentative priority rating between 75 and 92. Applications on file at the United States Office of Education March 12, 1951, show the following schools from this State to be in this priority group:

1. Renton.
2. Mukilteo.
3. Bremerton.
4. Central Kitsap.
5. Consolidated No. 20, Oak Harbor.
6. Othello.
7. Pasco district, No. 1.
8. Bridgeport district, No. 75.
9. Ephrata district, No. 165.
10. Grant County.

These schools have filed construction projects requesting $2,896,216 in Federal funds.

An increase in this deficiency appropriation to $100,000,000 will be sufficient to make partial allotments to additional applicants with a tentative priority rating between 40 and 75. Applications on file at the United States Office of Education March 12, 1951, show the following schools from this State to be in this priority group:

1. North Kitsap.
2. Franklin Pierce.
3. Kent.
4. Lake Washington.
5. Grandview.
6. Edmonds.
7. Issaquah.
8. Highland (Seattle).
9. Yakima County (Sunnyside).
10. Cape Flattery.
11. Bellevue.
12. Hockinson (Brush Prairie).
13. Granger.
14. Port Townsend.
15. Lacey.
16. Brainbridge Island, No. 803.
17. Steilacoom.
18. Wapate.
19. Head.
20. Shoreline.
21. Auburn.
22. River View.
23. Mercer Island.
24. South Kitsap, No. 402.
25. Coupeville.
26. Bethel, No. 403.

These schools have filed construction projects requesting a total of $7,091,209 in Federal funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee armendment on page 20, line 7, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 8, after the word "work", the committee proposes to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000", so as to read:

To enable the President, during the fiscal year 1951, to carry out the provisions of title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 209), relating to international children's welfare work, $7,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—Funds Appropriated to the President—Expenses of Defense Production," on page 20, line 12, after the word "production", to strike out "$33,029,000" and insert "$27,331,895"; on page 21, line 6, after the word "available", to insert "by transfer or otherwise", and in line 9, after the word "law", to strike out: "*Provided further*, That the appropriation 'Expenses of Defense Production, may be increased by transfer of not to exceed $1,834,000 of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 to the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and the General Services Administration for the purpose of carrying out the duties and responsibilities assigned to these agencies under provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations", on page 22, line 3, after the word "security", to insert "security guard services;", and in line 5, after the word "functions", to strike out "$1,750,000: *Provided*, That $110,000 shall be available for providing civil defense communications systems pursuant to subsection (c) of section 201 of said act", and insert "$74,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is amendment C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 5, after "functions", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "including entertainment expenses not to exceed $2,000 in connection with such meetings."

On page 22, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the amendment is in two parts. The first part of the amendment deals with the entertainment fund. As Members of the Senate know, in a number of branches of the executive department of the Government funds are provided for the entertainment of official visitors from foreign countries who come here on business in the normal course of events. Sometimes such funds are buried, where they are not understood.

When this question was raised with me I felt that it was far better to deal with the situation in the open, so that it

would be thoroughly understood. When it is necessary to entertain official visitors coming from Great Britain or other countries to confer with our civil-defense authorities, why should the expense of their entertainment be an out-of-pocket cost to the Administrator? I do not believe that it should be. I do not believe that it is customary for the President or for the State Department to handle official entertainment in that manner. The amount requested seems to be very nominal, and I think in equity it should be appropriated.

The important feature of this particular amendment is on page 22, line 8, to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

This item is primarily for training and education, and for research and development. I have had a memorandum prepared by the Civil Defense Organization on Research and Development. They ask for an additional $700,000. without going into detail, they need an additional $287,000 for training and education, which is a vital function now just getting under way.

With respect to research and development, the funds must be available now if we are to get the answers badly needed from the continental tests contemplated for next year. In those tests typical American city structures will be subjected to blasts under actual attack conditions. The answers which will be secured will clarify planning and recommendations for shelter strengthening.

I do not feel that it is necessary to go into too much detail. We all know that we are now living in the atomic age. We know that there is a great deal of information which is not yet available to us. It is public knowledge that certain tests have been conducted in the past, and undoubtedly there will be other tests in the future. It seems to me, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to be necessary and desirable to make this appropriation in order that the Civil Defense Organization may obtain the information which it feels it must have adequately to safeguard the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as this matter must go to conference anyway, it seems to me that whether the amount is $74,000,000 or $75,000,000 is a question which must finally be disposed of between the two Houses. Therefore, I am inclined to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to both parts of the amendment. The committee went into this matter thoroughly. If the work of the committee is all to go for nothing, we might just as well quit. I believe that at least we ought to have an opportunity to be heard.

So far as I know, there is only one agency of the United States which has entertainment funds made available to it, and that is the State Department. I think we are embarking upon a dangerous precedent when, in connection with a matter of this character and of this gravity, we turn aside to provide entertainment funds for anyone. Either the civil defense effort is necessary or it is not. Either we are in dire danger or we are not. If we are, we need every dollar that we can rake and scrape for real civil defense. I can see no reason for allowing $2,000 to the Civil Defense Agency for entertainment between now and the 30th of June. I think it is a bad mistake to begin that sort of thing, either in this bill or at any other time.

So far as the $74,000,000 item is concerned, Mr. President, it is broken down on page 5 of the committee report. A reasonably thorough examination was made at the time by the committee. When that item came to us the figure in the bill was $1,750,000. There was then a provision of $110,000 for defense communications systems. It has been increased to $74,000,000.

Mr. President, it is not as though this were all the money appropriated for this purpose. This is a third supplemental appropriation. It is an appropriation for funds to be expended, or necessary for expenditure, between now and the 30th of June of this year. That is a little more than a month and a half away. In the interim we will go thoroughly into these matters with respect to an annual appropriation for the period beginning on the 1st day of July and continuing for the next fiscal year. I hope that we shall have an opportunity on this side of the Capitol to go more thoroughly into these matters, and that we shall have the advantage of the work now being done by the House on the annual bill.

The figure which the Senate committee has reported is predicated on the proposition that it is mainly necessary in connection with commitments which could be made under contract authority, were the House willing to operate on that basis. It represents, in the majority, $40,000,000 for medical supplies. The testimony with respect to that item was that the present facilities for manufacture are not adequate, and that additional manufacturing facilities could not be guaranteed unless orders were placed for sufficient supplies to justify the additional capital outlay. That represents $40,000,000 of the $74,000,000.

On page 5 of the committee report there is a breakdown. I shall not go into it in detail. Senators can read it for themselves. If there are any questions with respect to any of the items, I shall be happy to explain them so far as I can.

I feel that the committee, after the investigation it made, placed sound figures in the bill. Particularly in view of the shortness of time before the end of the fiscal year, my view is that the committee's figures ought to be upheld by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while I cannot agree with the Senator from Oregon regarding the proposal for an entertainment allowance, I do not want the debate to revolve around a relatively small item. I think, however, the facts will show that other agencies of the Government, perhaps in a hidden manner, have funds for such purposes, so that there will not be an out-of-pocket expense to the administrator.

I wanted to raise the question on the floor of the Senate. It can perhaps more properly be discussed at the time of consideration of the regular appropriation bill.

So I ask, Mr. President, that my amendment lettered "C" be modified by striking out lines 1 to 3 dealing with the entertainment expense, and that the amendment lettered "C" be solely limited to the increase from $74,000,000 to $75,000,000 for the purpose of increasing the amount for training and education, and also for the purpose of research and development, which the Civil Defense Administration feels is vitally necessary to be added to the items already set up by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. I ask the Senator from California to refer to page 5 of the report and to the table there. Does he understand that the estimate for training and education which originally came to the Congress was for only $787,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. For which the committee allowed $500,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; and the agency feels that the $787,000 is essential for the purposes as I have outlined them.

Mr. CORDON. But the Senator has asked for a million dollars.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. For research and development, for which, on the table, the Senator will find there is no allocation in the Senate bill, the Civil Defense Administration originally requested $3,875,000. They are now asking $700,000.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator feel that the $200,000 above the amount necessary for training and education would be of any value in this short time remaining up to June 30, 1951?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, for the reasons that the Civil Defense Administration pointed out. There has been a delay in getting this program moving along, and they have a very strong belief that in this particular field the funds are both necessary and desirable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I reiterate my position. I think the moneys that are made available are adequate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. CORDON. I have concluded. I shall be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator from California advise me as to the amendments which he has suggested?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. The pending amendment, I may say, is amend-

ment lettered "C," as modified, which provides that, on page 22, line 8, "$74,000,000" be stricken out and "$75,000,000" be inserted.

I also have an amendment lettered "D" which deals with the shelter program.

Mr. McMAHON. May I ask if it is the disposition of the chairman of the subcommittee to take the amendments to conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have indicated that the sum of money we are taking to conference is $74,000,000; and I would just as soon take $75,000,000 to conference, and then it can be determined by the conferees what shall be done.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the Senator's attitude toward the protective facilities of $75,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is entirely another amendment, which we do not have under consideration at this time. The budget estimate was for $250,000,000. The House allowed $80,000,000. We struck it out entirely in the committee. The Senator from California desires to insert $25,000,000. Again that is a matter for conference. On the whole, $80,000,000 is in conference.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator disposed to accept the $25,000,000 provided for by the amendment lettered "D"?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot see any advantage in doing that, because the $80,000,000 is in conference. It is just a matter whether we have a difference between $25,000,000 and $80,000,000 or $80,000,000 and nothing.

Mr. McMAHON. I think it might be some indication to the conferees, though, if the Senate were to adopt the figure of $25,000,000. Is that not true? Would it not be somewhat persuasive, I will ask the Senator, if the Senate was to go on record for the amendment of the Senator from California providing $25,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not heard the Senator's argument. Up to now it merely appears to me that it would all be in conference anyway.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to add my very earnest request addressed to the chairman of the Senate committee and to other members of the committee, to allow the item of $25,000,000 also to go to conference. A very able, distinguished, and conscientious citizen of my own State is serving as Civil Defense Administrator. He has given a great amount of study and effort to this work. He has run, as Senators well know, into public apathy which is most discouraging. He is doing his best to get things started in a creditable manner, and in a manner which at least will point the way toward greater safety and security in this field, insofar as it can be accomplished.

Mr. President, as to the pending amendment on which the Senator from California has already spoken, I think he has made it abundantly clear that the omission of this additional $1,000,000 would be a distinct reduction of the program, a program in a very vital field, having to do with education. Governor Caldwell, the Civilian Defense Administrator, himself, has been to Britain with some of his staff members, and has examined what the British are doing. He reports this amount as being the absolute minimum to get this work started physically and administratively, in training both civilians and technical persons for the assumption of their heavy duties and responsibilities in the event the Nation needs them. Surely they are thinking that this program is a real insurance for the Nation.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] may yield in this matter. While it is true that the item will be in conference anyway, it seems to me that it would add materially to the giving of the impression that the Senate feels that the civilian defense effort is in earnest, and that it is a required effort, an effort that ought to be sustained—after all, the Congress provided for it not the Administrator—if we promptly place in the bill the amounts proposed in the amendments offered by the Senator from California, of which I am happy to say I joined him in submitting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the second amendment, but since the question has been raised, and we are dealing with the entire problem, I wish to say a word briefly in regard to the item of $25,000,000 for the shelter program. The $25,000,000 is requested for protective facilities as a bare minimum. A number of agencies have their plans ready to proceed with a shelter program. I desire to make very clear that Congress is not minimizing the need for an effective civil defense organization, that the Congress is conversant with the great need, and that as rapidly as funds may be needed for use in all these fields, including the shelter program, they will be made available.

One of the most damaging things that has happened, I believe, to the civil-defense program, is the impression which has become prevalent in the various State legislatures—and I think about two thirds of them are in session now—that in the Nation's Capital, where we have far more information than State legislatures have respecting the international picture, the Congress apparently is not interested in proceeding with this very minimum program. I believe it has tended to throw a wet blanket upon them and has tended to make them say, "If the Senate of the United States does not see the necessity for a shelter program, why should we proceed to bear the expense of undertaking such programs?" Of course, no one is wise enough to know, and no one can possibly have a crystal ball which will enable him to know, whether we shall ever need a shelter program. I think we all prayerfully hope we shall never need one. However, by the same token, no Member of the Senate today can say that next week or next month or next year this program will not be desperately needed.

I do not wish to attempt to assess responsibility, because perhaps the public and the Congress and the various States and the civil defense authorities themselves all must share the responsibility. However, I believe we have been lagging too much in carrying out an effective civil-defense program; and I think there is a calculated risk which I, as one Member of the Senate and as a Member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, do not feel we should undertake.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut be gracious enough to yield to me for one more comment?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; if it is a short one. I wish to proceed for about 6 or 7 minutes to state my position for the RECORD, so that it may be perfectly clear and history will show how I feel at this time in regard to this matter.

I yield now to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator very much for yielding to me. My remarks will be brief.

First, Mr. President, with reference to having this civil-defense item in a supplemental appropriation bill, I call attention to the fact that the committee amendment already provides that the amounts appropriated in this particular part of the appropriation bill shall remain available until June 30, 1952. In other words, it appears very clearly that we are providing the basis for a program which will continue not only during this fiscal year but also during the next fiscal year.

With reference to the shelter program, which is the larger one, I also call attention to the fact that the appropriations to be made for that purpose are not for expenditure or for commitment during the remainder of this year, but the appropriations for the shelter program are to remain available until they are expended, and in the appropriation there is a specific ban against contracting over and above the sum actually appropriated, which seems to me to be a very minimum amount for this most important objective.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, civil defense is an indispensable part of our total strategy for world peace. In two world wars the industrial output of America's workers and factories has meant the difference between victory and defeat. Stalin knows that he cannot achieve global conquest without knocking out our industrial plants and our cities. A smoothly operating and effectively functioning civil-defense program, if ready in time, will put the Kremlin and the rest of the world on notice that we are prepared to absorb any punishment which Stalin can deal out, and that we will maintain the capacity to deal devastating retaliatory blows. If the Soviet dictators understand this, they will understand also that a sneak attack cannot hope to paralyze us beyond recovery.

Contrariwise, a lack of adequate civil-defense appropriations and preparations will be an open invitation to aggression. Therefore, Mr. President, civil defense is the cheapest kind of peace insurance.

However, civil defense is war insurance, as well. If, despite our massive preparations against war, Stalin nonetheless strikes, our capacity to win will depend overwhelmingly on our ability to minimize and absorb punishment and to come back in spite of it.

I trust that no Member of the Senate doubts Russia's ability to drop a number of atomic bombs upon American citizens now, today. With all the solemnity at my command, I wish—in my capacity as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—to assure the Senate that the Soviets are stockpiling real atomic bombs in an ever-increasing number. No one who has had access to the evidence can believe otherwise. This is a matter of fact, not a matter of opinion. Stalin does have atomic weapons in his arsenal, and his stockpile is growing.

It is also a fact that Stalin has the means of delivering these weapons to targets within our country. In these days of long-range bombers, the Atlantic and the Pacific no longer furnish our cities with immunity against devastation. As President Truman so correctly pointed out last night:

> No matter how good our air defense may be, or how big an air force we build, a determined attack by the Soviet Union could drop bombs upon this country. Our Air Force experts say planes would get through, however good our defense may be.

Mr. President, it is sobering to remember that during World War II, the British Air Force—for all its valor and efficiency—intercepted no more than 8 percent of Hitler's bombers. In turn, the Luftwaffe rarely destroyed more than 4 percent of the allied bombing fleets. Just a few weeks ago Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg testified that our Air Force will score a real success if it is able to destroy from 20 percent to 30 percent of an attacking force. In other words, we shall be extremely lucky if only 7 out of every 10 planes dispatched by the Kremlin reach their targets. Let us remember that the Soviet planes will be carrying, not 500 pounds or 1,000 pounds of TNT, but weapons of mass destruction.

Against this background, then—with the indisputable knowledge that the Kremlin has atomic weapons and the ability to deliver them in a grand-slam assault upon Chicago or Seattle or Detroit or New York or Washington—it is now proposed that we cut drastically our civil defense appropriations. I find it difficult to imagine any course better designed to court a great tragedy.

A year and a half ago, when it was still the fashion to describe demands for a civil-defense program as what might be called scare-mongering, we of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a series of hearings on the problems of civil defense against atomic attack. The distinguished Senators and Members of the House who joined in conducting that inquiry, along with those of our colleagues who participated in the subsequent civil-defense hearings of the Armed Services Committee, became aware of how much time and money and skill are needed to create a civil-defense program that will give us more than an illusion of security. Those Senators and Representatives became acquainted also with the public's urgent and rightful demand for the greatest possible speed in readying our civil defenses.

I take it that this same sense of urgency was shared by the Eighty-first Congress when it passed, with but one dissenting vote, Public Law 920, the Civil Defense Act of 1950. In this act it is declared that—

> It is the policy and intent of Congress to provide a plan of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack.

That policy cannot now be carried out if the Civil Defense Administration is expected to operate without sufficient funds.

The Civil Defense Administrator, Governor Caldwell, who has previously distinguished himself both for his services in the House of Representatives and as an outstanding Governor of Florida, yields to no man in his solicitude for the taxpayers' dollar. All of us who know Governor Caldwell are well aware of his outstanding administrative talents. Together with his associates in the Civil Defense Administration, he has spent many weeks in preparing his budget. He knows the difference between false economy and real economy, and he knows, above all, that a dollar falsely saved now may mean a life needlessly lost later on.

We of this body have voted billions of dollars for our Defense Establishment, and rightfully so. Yet all these vast sums may prove of no avail if an attack finds our cities unprepared. An atomic attack against an unprepared America will be an irrevocable disaster. When bombs are falling, it will be too late to lament past inaction.

What happens in the future will depend upon what we do here now. Our responsibility in this matter cannot be evaded, and the American people will have every right to judge us harshly if we fail them now.

Mr. President, I say we must play fair with the people in the Civil Defense Administration by giving them sufficient funds with which to carry on this supremely important mission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have a suggestion regarding the amendment offered by the Senator from California, lettered "C," which I have discussed with the Senator. He has now modified the amendment, so that the only item under consideration is line 4 of the amendment, which proposes to increase the amount from $74,000,000 to $75,000,000. My suggestion—and it is a suggestion rather than a motion—is this: I was present in the committee when this amount was determined. We went over the various items making up the total of $74,000,000. We acted in accordance with the knowledge we had and to the best of our ability. We know that the most important thing is to get medical supplies and to provide the money for matching fire-fighting services. We adjusted the other amounts to the best of our ability. Rather than increase the amount from $74,000,000 to $75,000,000, my suggestion is that the breakdown of the committee's report be printed in the RECORD, and that the amount requested for engineering services be reduced by $640,000, and the amount for executive direction be reduced by $250,000.

I suggest the reduction because we are already approaching the end of the fiscal year, and it has been quite a long time since these amounts were calculated. The amount for research was increased to the figure suggested by the Senator from California, namely, $500,000. The committee allowed nothing for that item. It was recommended that the amount for welfare be increased from $500,000 to $890,000, which was the amount allowed by the House, so that those two figures would reduce the two items by $890,000, and would increase the other two items by $890,000, instead of adding $1,000,000 to the bill. I hope that my suggestion may be acceptable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I was listening to the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] within the past hour. Of course, all of us will agree that there is need for proper security. The amount of money which is being allocated will not even start the kind of protection about which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut was talking. That is the point. It is one of the big things in the hearings.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the Senator from Michigan wants to call up his amendment. I should like, however, to call attention to the fact that the administrator of this program, Mr. Caldwell, when asked the following question by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made this reply:

> Senator FERGUSON. What plans would you make if you could get all the money you needed on this thing?
>
> Mr. CALDWELL. Senator, a full civil-defense program of ultimate capacity would cost $300,000,000,000. This would include relocation.

I do not wish to throw cold water on any of the ideas which are being advanced, but certainly, as a member of the committee, I may say that when that was stated to me, I thought Members of the Senate should get the idea that, whether we appropriate $25,000,000 or $50,000,000, or whatever sum may be appropriated, we should not lead the American people to believe that we were going to have shelters which would protect them against a strategic bombing force, such as the one about which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut was speaking.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts will yield for a very brief observation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will yield; but I should like to say, first, to the Senator from Nebraska, that we are not now talking about the shelter amendment of the Senator from California; we are talking about his other amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to my dear colleague, I understood Senators were talking about all three of the amendments. They particularly discussed the one but a moment ago, when I raised the question, they said, "Well, only one has been offered, but we are talking about all three amendments."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been privileged to meet the former Governor of Florida, Mr. Caldwell, and from my contacts with him I do not hesitate to say he is a distinguished and honorable gentleman. So I regard the statement made by him as being fair.

Mr. WHERRY. I would say it is not an excessive statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He has been very frank in his approach to the Appropriations Committee. I feel that the suggestion which has been made is a fair solution until the first of July, and that the Governor's purpose can be accomplished without increasing the specific amount by a million dollars.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I cannot categorically say that the proposed redistribution would not work. I have great confidence in Governor Caldwell and in Mr. Wadsworth, his assistant. They are faced with a difficult problem. They are dealing with a new field. In the first place, we have not had to face the problem of civil defense the way it had to be faced in Europe, where the people actually came under bombardment. Heretofore neither in Europe nor in this country have the people been faced with the possibility of an atomic attack. Whatever is done, as the able Senator from Nebraska pointed out, will not give everyone protection. That is generally admitted. By the same token, in order to give absolute security to the Nation by radar defense it would cost many times more than is now being spent. To assure absolute air protection would require many times the number of air groups we have today. Even then we probably would not have absolutely protection.

But the other extreme is to do nothing in connection with the program. I do not believe that is the answer to the problem. There must be some rule of reason. The people need to gather information and get started on the program. The States must be encouraged to consider the whole problem.

It does not seem to me to be out of line to appropriate $25,000,000. It may ultimately end in a substantial saving in American lives.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was one of those who took the initiative in asking for civil defense. I have heard the testimony regarding a radar screen. I have voted for it every time proposed legislation has come up in connection with it. Certainly I am in favor of a strategic air force. I simply wanted to point out what I did in my statement because the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut indicated that if we can have this appropriation we will receive protection. That is what I understood him to say. Then I remembered the position of the committee and what a tremendous task would be involved and what the total cost would be. I think the people ought to know that $25,000,000 is only a drop in the bucket as compared with the total amount which may be required.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The able Senator from Massachusetts stated that there might be some redistribution of the funds. We cannot take $500,000 from the fire-fighting item or from engineering, and redistribute it. I would not set up my judgment against that of the Senator from Massachusetts. He may be right, and I may be wrong. Representatives of the civil-defense organization came to my office and stated that they believed this amount to be the absolute minimum, and that in the best interests of the job which they had taken the obligation to carry out, they needed a million dollars for this item and $25,000,000 under the protective facilities item.

I mentioned a short time ago that the additional training and education item amounted to $287,000, and that the additional research and development item amounted to $700,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate lay aside temporarily the pending amendment in order that I may offer an amendment on page 4, line 3, to provide for an additional amount of $5,000 for expenses of the majority policy committee and $5,000 for the minority policy committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Reserving the right to object, how many employees are presently on the payroll of the committees?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot tell the Senator exactly. There are 11 on the minority committee. I will ask the majority leader how many are on the majority committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ascertain whether this is necessary. It has not been brought before the full committee, and we are trying to save expenses. The amendment would increase the amount now being spent by $10,000. Before passing on it, I should like to look into it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection to the Senator's looking into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is a meeting of the Democratic steering committee at 5 o'clock this evening. Unless some Senator wants to place something in the RECORD, I should like the Senate to take a recess at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I withhold the request, Mr. President.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The resolution (H. Res. 223) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 8, 1951.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 139) was read, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have known JOHN KEE since 1915. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1930, and served continuously therein since that time. His service on the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which he was chairman at the time of his death, was also practically continuous.

JOHN KEE was a very fine American, whom I was proud to know. Association with him was an uplifting factor at all times in the consideration of governmental affairs. His death is a definite loss to the State of West Virginia, and as well, Mr. President, to the United States. Although for the past 10 years JOHN KEE suffered a serious physical handicap, yet he worked assiduously to perform faithfully his duties, up to the time he died. Such men as he are especially needed in the presence of such perilous conditions as those which now exist throughout the world. I mourn his loss and extend my sympathy to his family.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I worked very closely with Judge KEE during my days in the State Department. His loss will be particularly

mourned by the Foreign Service of the United States, in which he was deeply interested, and to which he had devoted his best efforts, in connection with the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. I associate myself in the sorrow and regret expressed by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleagues with respect to the death of Representative KEE. Certainly his passing is a great loss to his State and to the Nation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, Judge KEE was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, I was associated with him on many occasions. He was a man of high character, splendid attainments, and charming personality. I deeply grieve his passing. His State and the Nation have suffered a distinct loss in his death. I pay my respects to him, and lay upon his tomb the flowers of remembrance and regret.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the two Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative.

RECESS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late distinguished Representative from West Virginia, JOHN KEE, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Rosina F. Bachhuber
Sybil A. Grant
Myldred E. Jones
Rosalie W. Martin
Virginia K. Peterson
Mildred A. Robertson
Eleanor J. Sowers
Gladys M. Sperrle
Ethel A. Weyant

MEDICAL CORPS

Gioconda R. Saraniero

SUPPLY CORPS

Bessie Hagopian
Arlene M. Sheehan

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. LeRoy P. Hunt, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Jared Allen Walker et al. for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 26, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jared Allen Walker, which is shown on page 4540, and ending with the name of William Eugene Dye, which is shown on page 4541.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John C. LeDoux
Robert H. Miller
Robert A. Litke

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of James L. Beam et al. for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 24, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of James L. Beam, which appears on page 4391, and ending with the name of Cullen C. Zimmerman, which is shown on page 4394.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1462. A bill for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the compensation of employees of the House and Senate Press, Periodical, and Radio Galleries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1452) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

The measure, approved and supported by the American Library Association, will help the States to overcome a national shortage of libraries by providing library service to the millions of farm and rural families and others without such service.

The bill provides a basic grant to each State of $40,000 a year for 5 years with additional funds available under a variable matching formula based on rural population and per capita income. The cost of the program, not to exceed seven and one-half million dollars per year, will depend on how rapidly the States move to improve and extend library service.

The funds under the bill will be used by State library agencies for the development and promotion of State plans for demonstrating the value of library facilities and the extension of library service primarily in rural areas. The bill leaves the administration of the funds for the program entirely in the hands of State and local officials.

In spite of its importance to democracy the public library, like the public school, has been neglected. The Senate in twice approving Federal aid to education has recognized the national crisis that exists in our public schools. The Senate by approving a bill similar to that being introduced today has also recognized the need for public library service throughout the Nation as an aid to education.

Thirty-three million people in the Nation are without library service. Ninety percent of these live on farms and in small communities. An additional 35,000,000 have inadequate library service.

In only 11 States and the District of Columbia is public-library service available to as many as 85 percent of the people. More than 600 counties in the United States—roughly one out of five—are without any public library. Less than one-third of our 3,070 counties have county-wide library service.

The urgent need for strengthening our schools and library service is once again proven by the high rate of rejection of men under Selective Service for educational deficiencies.

We are experiencing again the same waste of manpower demonstrated in the last war through failure to gear our education system to meet the rising requirements of national security. Since Korea over 250,000 men have been rejected under Selective Service for educational deficiencies. That is the equivalent of 14 infantry divisions—three and one-half times as many divisions as the United States has committed to Europe. This is a loss too serious to disregard.

A recent 6 months' survey by the New York Times reveals the extent that the quality of public education is suffering by virtue of the great financial hardship under which our public schools are struggling. The survey shows that 3,500,000 rural boys and girls are receiving an inferior education due to overcrowded classrooms, shortages of well-trained teachers, inadequate courses of study, double sessions and part-time instruction. The greater the deterioration in the quality of public-school instruction, the greater must be the reliance upon the public library.

Library service complements and supplements the work of our schools by carrying the school into the home. Schools cannot serve their maximum usefulness without adequate libraries to provide home reading and other educational materials. The public library extends the educational process for the adult who may find that his schooling of 10 or 20 years ago is inadequate in meeting today's problems. This bill provides the cheapest and most effective way I know for bringing within the reach of every citizen the tools for continuous education.

Never in our history have the people had greater need for knowledge upon which to base their opinions and build their decisions. With the many grave problems facing our Nation today our national welfare demands that the ordinary citizen be able to get books, newspapers, and other sources of knowledge about the world he lives in.

The tasks of peace are the most difficult ever to challenge the genius of a nation. A highly trained, fully informed citizenry is essential to the defense of our freedom, the preservation of our country, and the building of lasting peace.

PATENT IN FEE TO JUANITA ELSIE RUNNELS GALLAHER

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the issuance of a patent in fee to Juanita Elsie Runnels Gallaher to lands allotted to her on the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me in reference to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1457) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Juanita Elsie Runnels Gallaher, introduced by Mr. Cain, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. Cain is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Mrs. Gallaher is of three-eighths Indian blood and married to a white man. Mr. and Mrs. Gallaher have been married for 17 years and have six children. Mr. Gallaher is engaged in logging and forestry work and in the operation of a sawmill and is dependent on his own work for the support of himself and family. Mrs. Gallaher advises that before her marriage she was employed as a bookkeeper and was treasurer of a lumber company for 1 year. Since her marriage her only occupation has been that of a housewife; that her husband is well able to care for herself and their family of six children. Mrs. Gallaher also advises that she has never been dependent on the Indian Bureau for any assistance. Mrs. Gallaher is desirous of obtaining a patent-in-fee to her land in order that the timber thereon may be available to her husband who owns a sawmill.

Mrs. Gallaher further advises that she will not sell her allotment nor the timber situated thereon to the tribal council for the reason the Indian Bureau, through its tribal council, will not pay a fair value for same and besides they will deduct a 10-percent commission for negotiating such sale, furthermore she and her husband are equipped to saw their own timber and are fully capable of handling their own affairs.

Much has been said by the Indian Bureau and by the committees and Members of Congress concerning the releasing from Federal supervision the various Indian tribes and individual members thereof, also the willingness and ability of the tribes and their individual members to dispense with Federal supervision and aid. In view of the fact that this individual member is willing and able to dispense with Federal supervision, she should be permitted to do so. Also in view of the declaration of the Department of the Interior officials, Federal supervision should not be enlarged, but diminished, wherever and whenever possible. I also submit the declaration of the House Committee on Appropriations in its report (H. Rept. No. 339, 82d Cong.) dated April 20, 1951, as follows: "The committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of the Indians into the general population. Unless this is done the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status and will never be able fully to enjoy the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship."

The enactment of this bill will permit Mrs. Gallaher to use her land to the best advantage to herself and family and would at least release that much land from under the supervision of the Indian Bureau, place said land on the tax rolls and the occupants thereon would take their places in their community with other citizens, Indian or non-Indian, who are contributing their share of responsibility to the local community, the State of Washington, and the Nation.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. BENTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

A radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 40," broadcast by him on May 7, 1951.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Address on the subject The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today, delivered by the Ambassador from Australia, Hon. Norman J. O. Makin, in the Vandenberg room, Senate Restaurant, March 29, 1951.

By Mr. HILL:

Letter entitled "The MacArthur Case in Light of Marshall's Grand Strategy," written by Dr. Clanton W. Williams to Lt. Richard McDonald Payne, published in the Tuscaloosa News of May 5, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "A Ghastly Mistake," published in the May 2, 1951, edition of the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., referring to the delay in publication of the report on conditions in Korea by Lieutenant General Wedemeyer.

By Mr. KERR:

Article entitled "Seven Great Decisions" written by Ralph McGill and published in the Atlanta Constitution of May 6, 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Editorial entitled "Tribute to the Marines," published in the New York Times of May 6, 1951.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

A letter regarding conditions in the United States and in the world, written by Lloyd O. Coulter, of Fitzwilliam Depot, N. H.

Article entitled "Truman Warning Taken Lightly," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Star of May 9, 1951, referring to the threat of a war with Russia.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

An article entitled "Shall We Have Allies or Face Reds Alone?" written by Carroll Binder and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 6, 1951.

An editorial entitled "Korean Policy Doesn't Add Up to Appeasement," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of May 8, 1951.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further routine matters, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 22, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert $75,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. The Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services are in session at the present moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN KOREA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, either prior to the conclusion of the hearings before the joint committee of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, or during those hearings, it is hoped that the investigation now taking place will hew to the line with sufficient vigor to provide the American public will clear-cut, consistent and conget answers to the following three questions which now plague the public generally. There are other questions which should also be answered as a result of these hearings, but it is important to our war effort and to the morale of both the free world and the United States that we get answer to the following three questions: (1) Who put us into the Korean War and by what legal authority? (2) What were the terms defining our military mission in Korea at the time the fighting began? (3) How are our military leaders and the American public to know when the job in Korea is done and the war is over? In other words, what is our war target in Korea?

One of the amazing and at the same time terribly disturbing features of our war in Korea is the great confusion which seems to exist over the method by which the United States became involved in the war and the legal basis upon which the President of the United States, acting on his own authority and without a declaration of war by Congress, could plunge us into what has already become the fourth most costly war in our Nation's history. A careful study of the constitutional powers of the President as well as the charter of the United Nations tends to make it more difficult rather than easier to understand and accept some of the public explanations of our high Government officials in this connection. About the only fact that stands out incontrovertibly is the fact that the war in Korea was never declared by the Congress of the United States and that whatever the legal basis may be for our involvement in that conflict, it was not by any action whatsoever of the American Congress.

In times past, some American Presidents have involved the fighting forces of this country in minor skirmishing abroad or in short-lived small wars by executive action. Up to now, however, these have always been justified as a military venture ordered by the President in defense of either the lives or property of America or in fulfillment of treaty obligations which had been entered into by this country through constitutional processes. It appears that neither of these justifications is applicable to the war in Korea in which we were involved by the action of President Truman last June.

It might be helpful for all of us as we look ahead to the future and try to determine an optimum program for bringing an early and victorious end to the war in which we are now so bloodily involved if we were to review objectively and dispassionately the actual steps and the legal circumstances, if any, by which we were involved in this war by Presidential action. That is to be my purpose here this afternoon. In studying the chronology of the conflict and our entrance into it, some very interesting evidence is available.

A CHRONOLOGY OF THE CONFLICT

After the Communist armies of North Korea violated the peace of that unhappy peninsula by striking south below the thirty-eighth parallel, an interesting, an intruging, and a somewhat mystifying series of developments ensued, and can be traced in the record. The first resolution adopted on June 25, 1950, by the Security Council called for the immediate cessation of hostilities; it called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel; it requested the United Nations Commission in Korea (a) to communicate its fully considered recommendations on the situation with the least possible delay; (b) to observe the withdrawal of the North Korean troops to the thirty-eighth parallel; and (c) to keep the Security Council informed on the execution of this resolution. This resolution also called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities. Mr. President, a little later on I shall have something to say about the manner in which members of the United Nations have flagrantly violated their obligation to refrain from giving assistance to North Korean authorities. But at this point I simply desire to suggest that nowhere in that resolution can I find any mention whatsoever of any request for the sending of military assistance to the Southern Korean forces. Nowhere in this resolution can I find any mention of a request for the sending of military assistance to the South Korean forces.

However, on June 27 the President in a statement to the public in this country announced that he had ordered the United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops, cover and support. He stated he had also ordered the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to neutralize the status of the Chinese national forces on that island. Finally the President instructed Ambassador Warren R. Austin, as a representative of the United States to the Security Council, to report the steps which he had taken to the Security Council.

At the time of the President's report to the Security Council on June 27 the United States representative also tabled a resolution calling for effective and immediate steps to secure peace and security and recommend that members of the UN furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area. The United States representative then read President Truman's statement on his action to the members of the Council. It was after hearing the President's statement, after hearing the President's report on the military inter-

the State Department. The second speaker will be Mr. Harold Fisher, director of the Hoover Library at Palo Alto, Calif.; and the third speaker will be Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, dean of the Union Theological Seminary, in New York, and not only one of America's most distinguished theologians and scholars, but one of its most eloquent.

Mr. President, this is the first time the UNESCO National Commission has asked the Members of Congress to participate in its deliberations. This body is one of the great forces in the intellectual world today. Its members include heads of great universities, scientists, representatives of leading private organizations, and Government officials.

The meeting will begin at 8 p. m., in the Coolidge Auditorium. I hope that many Members of the Senate will find time to take advantage of this opportunity to meet the distinguished members of the United States National Commission for UNESCO and to join with them in the discussion.

Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for his courtesy to me in this connection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

I wish to associate myself with the invitation which has been extended by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut. I think the meeting will be a very important one, and I think we shall have a good program. It seems to me that all of us need to know more about the great potentials of UNESCO and the fine work it already has done under the leadership of a very distinguished citizen of a republic to the south of us, Mexico.

So I hope all Members of the Senate will attend the meeting and will bring their wives with them, for I believe they are invited, also. I think we shall enjoy hearing a discussion of the problems of peace in this era when we have to discuss so much the problems of war.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, let me say that the purposes and objectives of UNESCO, on a multilateral basis, through the United Nations, and with the cooperation of all nations, are the same as those of the Smith-Mundt Act, of which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was the sponsor in the House of Representatives, and to the passage of which he gave such outstanding leadership.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut very much.

VOTE BY SENATOR CONNALLY TO HAVE OPEN HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in his broadcast of May 4, Fulton Lewis, Jr., commented at some length on what he said was my failure to vote that same day on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to take up a resolution for open hearings on the MacArthur affair.

The RECORD shows, of course, that that statement is palpably false—though it is no further from the truth than most of the other things Lewis says.

However, in order to give Lewis a chance to correct himself, I sent him, on May 7, a telegram calling attention to the fact that I did vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, and voted against it. Lewis saw fit to ignore this telegram; so I now ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 7, 1951.

Mr. FULTON LEWIS, JR.,
Mutual Broadcasting System,
Washington, D. C.:

In reference to your statement on your broadcast Friday night, May 4, that I did not vote on Wherry motion to consider opening MacArthur hearings to the public, I call your attention to page 4974 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date which shows that I did vote against Wherry motion.

TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RERORD at this point the yea-and-nay vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, as it appears on page 4974 of the RECORD of May 4. I call attention to the fact that my name is included on the list of Senators who voted "nay."

There being no objection, the vote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 41, as follows:

Yeas, 37: Bennett, Brewster, Bricker, Bridges, Butler of Maryland, Butler of Nebraska, Cain, Carlson, Case, Cordon, Dirksen, Dworshak, Ecton, Ferguson, Flanders, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Ives, Kem, Knowland, Langer, Lodge, McCarran, McCarthy, Martin, Millikin, Morse, Mundt, Nixon, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smith of New Jersey, Tobey, Wherry, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Nays, 41: Anderson, Byrd, Clements, Connally, Douglas, Ellender, Frear, Fulbright, Gillette, Green, Hayden, Hennings, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Humphrey, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Johnston of South Carlina, Kefauver, Kerr, Kilgore, Long, McClellan, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Maybank, Monroney, Moody, Murray, O'Conor, O'Mahoney, Pastore, Robertson, Russell, Smathers, Smith of North Carolina, Sparkman, Stennis, Underwood.

Not voting, 18: Aiken, Benton, Capehart, Chavez, Duff, Eastland, George, Hunt, Jenner, Lehman, Magnuson, Malone, Neely, Smith of Maine, Taft, Thye, Watkins, Welker.

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was rejected.

[Mr. LANGER addressed the Senate. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely: On page 26, between lines 20 and 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administator of the Economic Cooperation Administration any article or commodity of the nature or class described.

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

On page 26, line 21, strike out "SEC. 1302" and insert "SEC. 1303."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] I now send to the desk the amendment to the unfinished business (H. R. 3587), the third supplemental appropriation bill, which is now being handled on the floor by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I ask that the amendment may be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this amendment provides that no economic or financial assistance shall be provided out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance—other than military assistance—to foreign coountries, to any country which continues to sell war materials to Russia and her satellites, including Red China.

On April 19, 1950, more than a year ago, I presented to the Senate evidence in detail showing that Marshall-plan countries were making large shipments of war materials to Russia and her satellites. This evidence has never been contradicted. So far as I know my statements have never been denied. These shipments are continuing to the present day.

When the Marshall plan authorization bill was before the Senate last year I offered an amendment to automatically shut off aid to countries which continued to ship war materials to the Reds. The Senate saw fit to reject this amend-

ment. The objection was raised at that time that "it would interfere in the internal affairs of other countries." The argument, as I understand it, was that although the money of American taxpayers was going into these countries, the American Congress should not undertake to say how it should be spent.

When the supplemental appropriations bill came before the Senate last fall, I joined the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] in submitting a similar amendment, providing for an automatic termination of our economic aid to those countries which persisted in selling war materials to the Reds. The Senate adopted this amendment.

At this point, President Truman intervened. He sent a personal plea to the joint conference committee urging that the amendment not be included in the final bill. As a result, the amendment was watered down in the conference committee. As finally approved, the law, section 1304, Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, provides that economic aid is to be shut off to any country if the United States National Security Council finds that such country is carrying on trade with the Reds "contrary to the security interests of the United States."

The present membership of the National Security Council is as follows:

Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, Chairman.

Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States.

Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of State.

George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense.

W. Stuart Symington, a former Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, was a member of the National Security Council prior to his appointment as Administrator of the RFC.

Here is the situation in a nutshell: We are at war with North Korea and Red China. We are giving war materials to the Marshall-plan countries. These Marshall-plan countries in turn are selling identical materials to Russia and Red China.

So far as I have been able to find out, all the United States National Security Council has done is to consider, discuss, and negotiate. Not once have our gifts been suspended to any one of the Marshall-plan countries because it was shipping war materials to the Communists.

On March 9, 1951, I addressed a letter on this subject to President Truman, urging that the National Security Council act on this vital matter without further delay. I have yet to receive a reply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of my letter to the President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 9, 1951.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs. Kem and I have just returned from one of our occasional visits to Walter Reed Hospital, and, as always, we came away with heavy hearts at the sight of boys, some of them from Missouri, whose bodies and lives have been mangled in Korea.

I am writing you in your capacity as Chairman of the National Security Council of the United States. As you know, under section 1304 of Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950, no economic or financial assistance is to be provided by the United States to any foreign country whose trade with Russia or its satellites, including Red China, is found by the United States National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

Since this law went into effect, it has been repeatedly disclosed that several Marshall-plan countries are making large shipments of war-useful items to Russia and to Red China. British trade with Red China has been particularly active through her crown colony, Hong Kong, in such items as rubber and copper.

Department of Commerce officials advised my office this morning that $329,912.80 worth of machine tools were sold to Russia by Britain during January 1951 alone. Although Marshall-plan aid to Britain was suspended on January 1, 1951, goods and services are still reaching Britain through funds previously made available.

Britain is not the only offender. Belgium and France are also selling war-useful goods, including iron and steel, to the Reds. Large quantities of iron and steel have been sent to France and Belgium under the Marshall plan as a gift from the people of the United States.

Western European countries are selling equipment necessary to make A-bombs to Russia and her satellites.

On February 28, 1951, we were told in the press that ECA-aided factories in Italy were speeding products for Russia and that a Soviet economic party was in Genoa attempting to expedite deliveries of electric cranes and thermal power stations from two factories, which have been aided under the Marshall plan to the tune of $1,625,000.

Despite the seriousness of this situation, a staff member of the National Security Council advised my office this morning that the whole subject is being kept under review. The significant fact is that not once has Marshall-plan aid been terminated to any offending country, pursuant to Public Law 843.

For my part, I am against sending so much as a thimble or a hairpin as a gift from American people to any country which persists in sending war materials to the Reds, now slaughtering our boys in Korea.

I hope you will agree that this is a shocking business, that it is contrary to the security interests of the United States. I plead with you to see that the National Security Council acts on this vital matter without further delay.

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. KEM.

Mr. KEM. Why has not the President complied with the intent of the Congress as expressed in the act of September 27, 1950?

Surely none will deny, at this juncture of our affairs, that the flood of war materials to Russia and Red China is contrary to the security interests of the United States.

On May 2, 1951, the British Colonial Office disclosed that British Malaya sold 120,000 tons of rubber to Communist China and 40,400 tons to Soviet Russia in the 9 months ending in March—all since the outbreak of the war in Korea. Everyone knows that rubber is vital in the business of war. Our Government has taken steps to restrict sharply the use of rubber in civilian products in this country.

Secretary of Defense Marshall, during his testimony on May 7—just the other day—before the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, declared:

> Our own Government is engaged in a complete economic blockage (of Red China), but we have not been able to bring that about with the other nations, except to a limited extent.

The British continue to send shipload after shipload for the use of the Communist war machine that is striving to drive our boys into the sea. Only last night, a United Press dispatch dated May 8, from Singapore, informed us that British Malaya shipped 9,589 tons of rubber to Russia and Communist China last month. Hong Kong received 5,846 tons, and some of this may have found its way into Communist China.

According to an Associated Press dispatch from London dated April 30, 1951, Britain has exported goods worth $3,614,800 to Communist China during the past 3 months. Sir Hartley Shawcross, then president of the British Board of Trade, listed the following among the exports: Iron and steel manufactures, $644,000; electrical goods and apparatus, $456,400; and chemicals, drugs, dyes, and colors, $294,000. Some of the same items have been furnished by the United States to Britain under the Marshall plan.

During his testimony before the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations just a few days ago, General MacArthur spoke darkly of the "flow of strategic materials" to Red China "which has been going on so extensively since the Korean war started." He said:

> I think that the port of Hong Kong is now a means by which great quantities of materials, strategic and otherwise, pour through into Red China.

General MacArthur had with him a report dated March 29, 1951, from the American Consul General at Hong Kong, as to the strategic materials which had gone through Hong Kong and reached the Red Chinese during 3 weeks alone.

General MacArthur described the list of strategic materials as "very compendious." He said:

> It consists of many chemicals: Ammonium chloride, sulfate, arsenic acid, and so on—a whole page of those.
>
> Instruments and accessories: Electric meters, wires, various apparatus of that sort.
>
> Radio parts: Radio sets, telephone sets, transformers, wire recorders.
>
> Under machinery and fuels: Ball and roller bearings, drills, and electric drills, electric motors, hammers, metal tools, spanners, pliers, and so on.
>
> Minerals: Asphalt, asbestos, coal tar.
>
> Medicines of various sorts.
>
> Metals: Aluminum scrap, ingots, bars, brass plates, bars, copper wire, iron plates, iron nails, high-speed steel, lead sheets, ingots, silicon steel sheets, steel bars, welding rods, zinc sheets, and so on.
>
> Miscellaneous: Boiler materials, cameras, cement, fertilizers.
>
> Laboratory equipment: Microscopes, rubber, rubber accelerators.
>
> Petroleums: Diesel oils, fuel oils, gasoline, grease, kerosene, lubricants, paraffins, and so on.

After General MacArthur had finished reading from the list of strategic materials which had gone from Hong Kong to Red China, the following colloquy occurred between him and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]:

Senator KNOWLAND. General, that, I think, would be sufficient at this time. I would like to ask your judgment as a professional soldier for more than fifty years and as the responsible commander in the Far East, whether it is your judgment that such material would have been of substantial assistance to the Communist force opposing our troops and the other United Nations troops in Korea, and to some extent almost as valuable as actual munitions of war.

General MACARTHUR. There is no question about it, especially petroleum, gasoline, and things of that sort. It it the very essence of the movemement of an Army and armed troops.

Mr. President, the British are not the only offenders, not by any means. According to the latest information available at the Department of Commerce, the following additional countries are carrying on a lucrative war trade with the Reds: Austria, France, Western Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium-Luxemborg, Italy, and Sweden.

All are Marshall Plan countries. The American people send to all of them, as gifts, many of the same items which they, in turn, are selling to the Russians and to Red China.

During the first nine months of 1950, Austria sold the following items to the Reds: iron and steel manufactures, $10,797,000; pig iron, iron and steel scrap, $1,273,000.

During the same period France exported the following items to Russia and her satellites: steel-mill products, hot-rolled sheets and plates, $1,744,000; lead and alloys, $709,000; ball bearings, conveying equipment, and so forth, $1,023,000; machine tools and parts, $1,776,000.

Western Germany exported to the Soviet bloc iron and steel scrap, $5,522,000; copper, $283,000; steel bars and shapes, $3,800,000; machine tools, $5,634,000.

The Netherlands: tin and manufactures, $5,242,000; machinery and appliances, electrotechnical material, $2,821,000.

Denmark: machinery and apparatus, except electrical, $2,289,000; vehicles and transportation equipment, $1,784,000.

Belgium-Luxemburg: iron, cast-iron, steel and manufactures, $3,117,000; copper, alloys and manufactures, $5,659,000, of which $3,003,000 went to the U. S. S. R.; electrical machinery, appliances, apparatus, and parts, $4,509,000.

And so it goes.

We give iron and steel to Belgium; Belgium sells the same items to the Reds. Does that make sense? It does not in my book. It did not make sense 10 months ago, and it does not make sense now.

Italy, one of the worst offenders, sold to the Reds machinery, apparatus, and parts, $18,863,000; scientific instruments and parts, $346,000.

Sweden: malleable iron and steel, and products, $9,703,000; electrical machinery and apparatus, $6,912,000; other machinery and apparatus, $16,475,000.

According to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, the Soviet Union and its satellites received almost twice as much machinery from Western European countries last year as in 1948. In other words, Mr. President, the exportation of materials from Western Europe to the Soviet Union and the satellite countries was increased 100 percent in 1949, as compared with 1948.

In 1950, according to the United Nations Commission, 10 Western European powers shipped $269,000,000 worth of engineering products to iron-curtain countries.

The survey found that Britain had replaced Germany as the chief supplier of machinery products to the Reds, shipping $70,800,000 worth in 1950. Meanwhile, United States machinery exports to the Reds virtually ceased.

Mr. President, one could go on indefinitely, piling case on case. I shall not ask the Senate to listen to further statistics. Suffice it to say that the proof is ample and undisputed that the Reds are being armed through our allies. There can be no doubt on the record that many American boys in Korea have been struck down by weapons provided, in whole or in part, through our so-called friends in Western Europe.

It has been nearly 11 months since the President ordered our Armed Forces into Korea. The United States has supplied 90 percent of the troops in the United Nations' war there, and our boys have suffered 90 percent of the casualties. If our allies are not willing to do their share of the fighting, surely the least they should do is to stop giving aid and comfort to the enemy. We have dilly-dallied too long. The time for thumb-twiddling has passed.

This is a tragic situation. There are now in the Government many men who have seen honorable service in combat in the armed services of the United States. How can anyone who has seen American blood spilled in battle tolerate the outrageous practices just described continuing unchecked, month after month? This is beyond my powers of comprehension.

But facts are facts. The President has not acted. It is up to the Congress now. Let it not be said that Congress is guilty of a callous disregard of the welfare and safety of our brave, outnumbered men in Korea.

I yield the floor.

UNITY IN REPUBLICAN RANKS—PROTECTION OF MILITARY SECRETS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed this afternoon by some speeches on the floor. I was especially impressed by the magnificent plea for unity made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I do not know which branch of the Republican leadership he sought unity for or with. As I understood the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, he placed in nomination the name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the next President of the United States. I do not know how much unity there is in the ranks of those on his side of the aisle in favor of such a program. I do not know whether the Senator from South Dakota seeks to unify his party behind the late President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, who would retire our military forces from around the world and retreat to our own shores. I do not know whether he seeks to unite his party behind those who believe with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that we should write, on the floor of the Senate, the specifications of what our military leaders should do, and in what areas, and what they should not do; or whether the Senator from South Dakota seeks to unify them between those of his party who support the recommendations of the late distinguished and, I think, immortal Vandenberg, of Michigan, and the distinguished commander of our forces in Europe, General Eisenhower.

Just as I was about to feel that the plea of the Senator from South Dakota for unity might have some effect upon Senators, I was amazed to see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota rise to take a position of declining to unify with the Senator from South Dakota. In fact, I rather enjoyed the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota, because, as I understand, he was reading the obituaries of many of those on his side of the aisle. I must say that I was quite surprised, but I was as greatly entertained. Further, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota said that General Marshall and the administration should write a blueprint of victory which all Americans can read. That is in line with the headline I note in the Evening Star of this afternoon, "GOP demands Marshall clarify plan to end war." I quote further:

Republicans were demanding a clearer answer to the question of how the administration expects to end the Korean War.

Mr. President, the strategy of modern warfare operates something like a contest on the gridiron. A successful offense always keeps the opposition guessing—whether it is a general moving armies or the quarterback calling signals. Mr. President, you know how it is at a football game. The fans are simply bursting with curiosity as they watch the quarterback huddle with his team, and the opposing players would give anything to know in advance just what to expect from the men whose task it is to carry the ball.

The football team of the great University of Oklahoma has won world-wide recognition and fame by reason of their amazingly successful offenses. Those offenses have been built on deception, surprise, and power. Mr. President, the opposing teams wring their hands and wrack their brains trying to figure out what the next move of those quarterbacks, handling that amazingly deceptive split-T formation might be And it is the same way in warfare, Mr. President.

Surprise and deception are the weapons of the attacker, and the defender relies on intelligence operations and shrewd forecasts to place him in the best blocking position. These elements often

mean the difference between victory and defeat. That is why it is so vitally necessary to protect our military secrets. That is why the Senate committee hearings are not wide open to the world. We must be certain that not one word of valuable information which would endanger the security of our fighting forces and the Nation should be dropped to the enemy.

General MacArthur has told the world what he would do to bring the war in Korea to a successful termination. That information has little value to our enemies, because General MacArthur's policies are not the program of the United States and the United Nations. However, Mr. President, it is a far different situation with General Marshall. What our Secretary of Defense thinks, knows, and plans is of supreme and vital importance to the enemy, and this information must be guarded as zealously as is possible insofar as its disclosure in any way that might make it available to the enemy is concerned. That is why so much of his testimony had to be deleted from the record of the hearings.

What can sane men be thinking of who say, "We demand that Marshall clarify plans to end the war in Korea. We are going to demand more detailed information from General Marshall as to what those war plans are, as to what the blueprint for victory in Korea is."

Mr. President, if General Marshall were a prisoner of Russia, the Russians would cross-examine him; they might even torture him to wring that information from him. I believe Secretary Marshall, magnificent patriot that he is, would endure torture or even death before he would give that information to the enemy. But what can he do, Mr. President, when United States Senators cross-examine, browbeat and threaten him, trying to force him to divulge to the world that same information? Oh, political ambition, what crimes are committed in thy name

However, Mr. President, I must say that if the enemy were as unable to understand the information, if given, as are many of those who cross-examine the Secretary of Defense, it would not hurt too much.

I am reminded of the story of a group of industrial pioneers who, in the early days in Oklahoma, built a great industrial empire. As the years passed, one of the partners died. He had two sons who came on, and, of course, inherited an interest in the business. One day the local manager at one of the plants in western Oklahoma called the general manager at Oklahoma City and said to him, "The two sons of your deceased partner are here, and they have demanded that I show them the books of our company. What shall I do?"

That great old general manager said to him, "Show them the books, of course. Let these men see the books. In the first place, they are stockholders and are entitled to see them."

Then he added, "In the second place, they will not know any more about them after they have examined them than they did before."

I am aware of the application of that story to many who cross-examined the Secretary of Defense. But no such situation prevails with reference to our enemies, who are watching and listening carefully to every word that comes out of those committee-room doors.

Again referring to football, Mr. President, I have seen but one team in my life which followed the policy of open strategy openly arrived at which has been advocated here by some Senators. It was a Negro team with a fullback who was 6 feet 4 inches tall and who weighed approximately 240 pounds. He called the signals, ran the team, and carried the ball most of the time. He never put his team into a huddle; he just lined them up and announced the plays to both teams and to the world. For example, he would say, "This is my play: I am going around right end. Give me the ball." And he would do so. As soon as that play was executed he would not waste any time in a huddle, his team immediately going back into formation, and he would say, again, so that all on either side, or anyone else, if they listened, could hear, "This is my play: I am going over left tackle. Give me the ball." He was big enough and powerful enough to do that and get away with it.

I wish our country were strong enough to operate on that basis, Mr. President. Obviously, however, our war strategy, our plans, our strength, and our weakness must not be advertised to our enemies. On the other hand, Mr. President, we must have confidence in the ability and good faith of our military experts. For my part, I thank God that the security of this Nation is being guarded by a grand old soldier like General Marshall and by the distinguished group of Chiefs of Staff that are gathered around him.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit for 5 minutes while the Senate is in session.

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, does the Senator anticipate that the business which would be taken up can be disposed of in 5 minutes?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], to the committee amendment on page 22, beginning in line 5, to increase the amount stated in line 8 to $75,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Thye
Ellender	McClellan	Tobey
Ferguson	McFarland	Underwood
Flanders	McKellar	Welker
Frear	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Martin	Young
Gillette	Maybank	
Green	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

THE TORQUAY AGREEMENTS

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we are slowly destroying the economic system of this country. We are doing it through several channels.

DESTRUCTION OF OUR CURRENCY BASE

First, we have destroyed the foundation for our currency system through the removal of the metal base for our currency.

DESTRUCTION OF FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

Second, free trade by the division of the markets of the United States with the nations of the earth on a one-economic-world basis through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended.

Calendar No. 281

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 1 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 22, line 5, after "functions" insert a comma and the following: "including entertainment expenses not to exceed $2,000 in connection with such meetings".

On page 22, line 8, strike out "$74,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000".

5-1-51——C

Calendar No. 281

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

MAY 1 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

DESTRUCTION THROUGH TAXATION

Third, the legalized imposition of income and other taxes to the point of diminishing returns, when it has become necessary to sell bonds and indulge in deficit financing each year to keep the economy afloat.

SUBSIDIES FROM ALL TAXPAYERS

Fourth, subsidies to take the place of the tariffs and import fees, coming from the taxpayers of America.

DESTROYING SOURCES OF NEW CAPITAL

Fifth, the Securities and Exchange Commission making it impossible to sell stock in an enterprise unless the engineers and hand-raised economists of the Securities and Exchange Commission say that the enterprise will make money.

FREE TRADE VERSUS WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

Mr. President, first considering the free-trade program of the administration, today's Journal of Commerce, May 9, 1951, carries on its front page the headline: "Extensive Tariff Slashes Made by the United States, 17 Nations in the Torquay Agreements."

The floor under American wages and investments is further lowered in the haphazard tariff- and import-fee slashes made by the State Department at Torquay, England, without regard to the "fair and reasonable" competition principle.

HIGH LIGHTS OF TORQUAY SLASHES

The high lights of the Torquay Conference agreement are coming out at a very opportune time in that the Senate Finance Committee has just reported a bill which would extend for 2 years more the authority of the Secretary of State, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, further to select the industries that are to be sacrificed on the altar of one economic world, and the industries that are to be preserved.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF EXECUTIVE'S AUTHORITY OVER WORKERS AND INVESTORS

The economy of the Nation is to be placed in the hands of a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State for an additional 2 years—under the Senate bill—so that he may repeat, if he so desires, the Torquay Conference, which has just been concluded.

THE STERLING BLOC REFUSES TO RELINQUISH EMPIRE PREFERENTIAL RATES

On page 29 of the Journal of Commerce in the continuation of the dispatch about which I spoke of as appearing on the first page, referring to the conclusions and the effect of the Torquay Conference, is a paragraph which is very significant. It is as follows:

Attempts to conclude trade agreements with Australia, Cuba, India, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom failed.

They retain their famous Empire preferential rates, while falling heir to all of the benefits of the Torquay Conference through the most-favored-nation clause.

It may be of interest to the Senate to know that the British Empire—the sterling bloc—have previously made agreements with this country which they rendered ineffective on their part almost immediately after agreeing to such tariff reductions, by resorting to quotas, embargoes, specifications, and manipulation of their money systems, to defeat the objective of the agreements.

For example, we found after investigation that specifications were laid down on automobiles that could be shipped into a certain country—Bermuda, I think, an English possession. It appeared reasonable enough to have these specifications laid down. Because of the shortage of road money, small cars would be preferable, but it was soon realized that only an English car met the specifications. That is only one instance out of many.

After defeating, by means of such subterfuges, the announced objective of the trade treaties that the sterling bloc countries have entered into, they now refuse to go into any more agreements; but under the most-favored-nation clause, every agreement the United States makes with other nations in lowering and reducing tariffs and import fees is immediately available to all other nations including the countries of the sterling bloc—the British Empire.

AN EMERGENCY ECONOMY

Mr. President, we have established an emergency economy. The Torquay conference provides that that approximately 3,000 products can be shipped into the United States under the lowered tariffs.

We say we want peace, but our national economy could not survive 60 days if we had peace, Mr. President.

The entire economic structure of the United States would crumble under a peace economy simply because we must resort to deficit financing—taxpayers' money from the United States Treasury to keep our economy afloat.

We have built up a deficit financing economy over the past 18 years—when we are unable to continue on some pretext to keep the economy going through subsidies or contracts, then the products of the slave labor will wreck our economy by pouring into our country, unchecked in competition with our workers and investors. We have reached a point where even if we had peace—the peace which all of us say we want—we could not live under it.

BILL TO EXTEND SECRETARY OF STATE AUTHORITY

Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee has reported unanimously the bill extending for two more years the authority of the Secretary of State to select the industries to survive and the industries and investments that are to be sacrificed upon the alter of our economic world.

SENATE MUST VOTE

Mr. President, the Senate is to vote on the bill. If we are willing to extend the authority of the Secretary of State's control of the regulation of foreign commerce and the resulting control of the national economy for two more years, that will mark the final abandonment of the workingmen and the investors of our Nation.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE-NATIONAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

We find the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Manufacturers Association on record as favoring free trade.

They mainly represent organizations, individuals, corporations, and partnerships in our country, large enough to establish plants in foreign countries to supply the products needed in those foreign areas, not only the markets which the so-called reciprocal trade program was supposed to secure for the businessman of the United States, but through free trade displace the American workers and investors of this Nation through sweat-shop labor imports. The Marshall plan—with $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 a year going to Europe—was also supposed to create markets for the businessmen of our country.

So through the free trade program the large business organizations of the United States establish their plants in those foreign countries and not only supply the markets of those areas, which are financed by the American taxpayers, but then ship the products of low-cost labor of Asia and Europe into this country. We are simply transferring American jobs to foreign soil.

THREE THOUSAND PRODUCTS—INCREASED IMPORTS

Mr. President, a preliminary analysis of the report issued today by the State Department on the Torquay conference shows that tariffs on approximately 360 commodities and commodity groups—commodity groups meaning the numbers of the paragraphs used in listing the groups in the Trade Agreement Act of 1934—amounting to approximately 3,000 different products, have been either substantially reduced or have been bound against any increase, regardless of any injury to American industry, American workingmen, and American investors.

SENATE SHOULD TAKE NOTICE

So, Mr. President, it behooves the Members of the Senate to read the newspaper reports about that conference, even if they never analyze and digest them.

The 2-inch-thick report which came out yesterday simply lists those reductions. All Senators should examine the entire report, to see for themselves whether they think our Nation can live in peace—the peace that every Member of the Senate says he wants, while under the cover of war and so-called emergencies, the administration authorities are pulling the rug right out from under the small-business men and the workers and investors of the United States of America.

LUCKILY BILL DELAYED

Mr. President, I hope all Members of the Senate will analyze the results of the Torquay conference.

I am very glad that the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for another 2 years has been delayed until the results of the Torquay conference are available.

The bill is reported with amendments, one amendment the so-called peril point. The peril-point amendment, Mr. President, requires the President of the United States to write Congress a letter, provided he disregards the Tariff Commission warning that any such rate would injure an industry.

Mr. President, how much trouble do you think it would be for the present President of the United States to write a letter to Congress? Perhaps now he is running out of people to whom he can write letters. All the President would need to do would be to write to the Congress a letter telling Congress what a great job he is doing on the "one economic world" tradition the administration has established.

Then we have a broadened escape clause amendment. The President may invoke that clause if he cares to do so. It is to be noted that the word "must" is not included in the bill, but the President may invoke the clause. Of course, since the administration has made clear for the last 18 years that its objective is to divide the markets of the United States with the nations of the rest of the world, I leave it to the President of the Senate to judge for himself whether any escape clause—whether a part of the bill or whether written in by the State Department—will ever be invoked.

Mr. President, in due course I shall discuss the other four points I make in connection with my statement that the administration is destroying the economy of the United States.

Again I wish to say that there is no use saying that Mr. Roosevelt was responsible for "free trade" in the United States and the division of the United States markets with the rest of the world and the "one economic world" theory, and there is no use saying that Mr. Truman has continued it, because the Senate of the United States must vote to approve it. It is the United States Senate that is to blame for its initial approval of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—for each of its 3-year extensions—and will be responsible if a 2-year extension of an irresponsible Secretary of State's authority over the lives of the workers and investors of this Nation is voted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point excerpts from a dispatch to the Wall Street Journal relative to the effect of the Torquay agreements.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam has agreed on a new "horse-trade."

The United States will cut tariffs on a sizable chunk of our imports from all countries—heavily.

In return, nine countries will reduce their tariffs on United States goods—modestly. Six others agreed to minor concessions.

It figures out this way:

The United States will cut tariffs from 25 percent to 50 percent on a tenth of all the goods on which we now charge import duties.

In return, the United States will get tariff cuts from the 15 foreign countries on less than one-twentieth of United States exports. Most of these cuts will be trivial.

THIRTY-COUNTRY CONFAB

That in a nutshell is the result of the 30-country tariff conference just ended at Torquay, England, after 8 months of discussions.

One conference paradox: The United States tariff talks with Britain broke down—because the British were unwilling to make any important concessions to us. Yet Britain will be one of the big gainers from United States tariff cuts.

"That's because the cuts we give to one country, we automatically give to every country, even to those countries that won't cooperate," says one official.

Another conference paradox: 16 countries at Torquay announced they were raising some of their tariffs. France, for example, said she was raising duties on 38 types of goods.

Theoretically, these 16 countries made new tariff cuts to make up for the ones they raised. Mostly, though, the concessions they renounced were greater than the new cuts they offered in exchange.

* * * * *

Then there are cuts on cocoa and chocolate, on Italian matches, on tanning extract, French garters, drawing ink, Korean iodine, lampblack, white lead, mica, German razors, telescopes, swords, and sewing machines—to say nothing of Swedish taximeters, German pistols and revolvers, Turkish licorice, Brazilian plywood, Canadian cream, French post cards, Norwegian fish cakes and acetic acids. Musical instruments, and radios and television are included too, along with a host of other goods, important and trivial.

Many American businessmen are going to be worried by these tariff cuts. There are 50 percent lower duties on many types of clocks and clock movements and parts, for example.

American canners won't be happy about the 40-percent cut which United States diplomats promise on imported canned salmon.

EARTHENWARE AND FILBERTS

American makers may be miffed by the lowered rates in store for Italian earthenware.

American nut growers—who have been complaining about tariffs being too low—won't be happy that United States negotiators promised not to raise duties on imported filberts. American fig, grape, and raisin growers will be bothered about the new low rates on these imported fruits.

American manufacturers are going to be bothered by growing competition from West German exporters. A key to what's coming shows up in the United States tariff cuts won by German negotiators:

The Germans argued for and won lowered United States duties on china, chinaware, drawing instruments, clocks, and on wool yarns and a wide variety of toys. Harmonica tariffs were slashed in half; camera duties a quarter. Duties on some coal-tar chemicals were cut in half. A wide range of German machinery will also get in cheaper.

* * * * *

Officials here say it's not certain when these new tariff rates will take effect. Some will start in June. Others will be put into effect gradually between June and November this year as the conference countries ratify the Torquay agreements. Each of the 147 separate Torquay agreements will go into effect 1 month after the countries concerned ratify.

The United States doesn't have to ratify its agreements. That has already been taken care of by Congress in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which permits the President to raise or lower tariffs at will, within certain limits.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bill for a 2-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreement Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—not only should be defeated but Congress should substitute the Senate bill 981 providing for fixing tariffs and import fees on a basis of fair and reasonable competition for it.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that we are considering my amendment "C," as modified. It was modified to strike out the first three lines, so that the amendment now reads, "On page 22, line 8, strike out '$74,000,000' and insert '$75,000,000'."

As I explained yesterday, this amount is made up of $287,000 for training and education in the civil-defense set-up, and $713,000 for research and development. The civil-defense authorities believe that this amount is essential.

As to the research-development phase, considering the atomic situation, they plan at an early date, on a continental basis, to test certain building materials so as to determine what the effects would be on the typical type of construction which we find in the American cities. This appropriation would expedite that program.

As I pointed out yesterday, no one can categorically say that precisely this $1,000,000 additional is essential, and that they could not get along with $980,000 or some lesser or some greater amount, but in charge of the program are former Governor Caldwell, of Florida, who, I believe, is an able administrator, and Mr. Wadsworth, the son of a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, both of whom are men of high caliber who have taken upon themselves a tough job. Under those circumstances, and speaking as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I personally believe that this money would be well spent, if it were made available to them.

I think there is involved a calculated risk which, in the uncertain international situation which we now face, I personally would not want to take, if we failed to go ahead with the program as rapidly as we should.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator from California tell us where the shelters are to be constructed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. This particular item is not the shelter item. It appears on page 22, line 8, and if the Senator will look at the committee report, on page 5, he will find a breakdown of the committee's recommendation of $74,000,000. The only change which this would provide would be that the amount for training and education would be raised from the $500,000, which the committee allowed, to $787,000, which was the estimate, and it would provide, for research

and development, $713,000. That is where it would go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], to the committee amendment, on page 22, line 8, to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer my amendment lettered A which I ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That financial contributions under the authority of subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 may be made with respect to civil defense programs or projects initiated by the States on or after January 12, 1951, notwithstanding the fact that State funds therefor were obligated or expended prior to approval by the Administrator, if such programs or projects have been approved by the Administrator subsequent to that date."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there was testimony in the committee hearings relative to this matter, as to how far back it might be possible to go in matching funds. Counsel for the Administrator felt that they could definitely go back to January 12, which was the day when the law itself became effective.

The reason for the amendment is that a considerable number of the States have moved ahead with their civil-defense programs. It did not seem equitable that they should be penalized in matching funds for the specified equipment provided in subsection (i) of the act. If they were, the States which delayed action in order to see what, if anything, the Federal Government might do, would be the beneficiaries, while the States which had moved ahead would be penalized for having moved ahead. This amendment merely makes it clear that the Administrator is authorized to go back to January 12, provided the various States meet fully the specifications which the Administrator will outline. There are no funds involved in amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was on page 22, to strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive, as follows:

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call up my final amendment, lettered "D," dated May 1, 1951, on page 22. My amendment proposes to substitute for the language the committee recommends be stricken out the following:

PROTECTIVE FACILITIES

For financial contributions to the States for shelters and other protective facilities pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, 1950, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not approve any program or project for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limits of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this is an important subject. I do not intend to take a great deal of the Senate's time, because the reason for the proposal I make can be stated very quickly.

The bill, as it came from the Appropriations Committee, provided no funds for this shelter program. It is quite true that no one should vote for the amendment with the conception that it would afford the American people adequate protection against atomic attack, because the fact of the matter is that the testimony shows that the cost of a program which would give a reasonable degree of adequacy of protection in the shelter development would exceed $300,000,000,000, which appears to be out of any reasonable hope of being reached in either the near or distant future. However, the facts indicate that the various States have been making some studies. Some work has been done on the program. In probably two-thirds of the States of the Union their legislatures are now in session.

We passed a bill which gave indication that there would be funds for shelter development. I must say in all frankness this would be only a drop in the bucket for any adequate shelter program. I personally think that a great deal of additional study needs to be made as to what, for example, might be done in strengthening basements of office buildings or of warehouses, to see whether it is possible to make use of existing facilities, or so to construct them or perhaps reinforce them as to make them suitable as shelters.

My only viewpoint is that the Congress of the United States should not throw a wet blanket over the shelter-development program, because certainly, in the event of an atomic attack a heavy responsibility will rest upon all Government officials, the executive branch and the legislative branch of the Government as well. This seems to me, at least, to furnish a sufficient amount of funds to go ahead with the program and do some experimenting in this field.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator from California has given a great deal of thought and study to this subject. I ask him if he looks upon his amendment as a stepping stone toward a huge appropriation by the Federal Government for shelter programs for the Nation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would express my personal view to the Senator in this way, that I do not think anyone can give a categorical answer to just what the development of shelters should be. Certainly the testimony before the committee has indicated that it would require a fantastic amount of money to provide what is now considered to be any reasonable protection for the American people. I think the testimony indicates that more than $300,000,000,000 would be needed. That certainly does not seem within our reach in even the distant future. But I believe that with the amount which has been suggested, we could at least take the matter to conference and make whatever explanations are necessary if called upon to do so, and we might develop a program, whereby, instead of providing the large centers which many persons are now thinking of, perhaps existing types of buildings and facilities could be used, after being reinforced. I think that would be a far more practical viewpoint of the situation, expressing merely my personal view of the matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. Who is going to determine where the money will be used? There are 48 States, and in every State there are probably persons living in certain cities and communities who feel that they are a possible atomic-bomb target.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My understanding of the law—and the Senator can correct me if I am mistaken—is that the basic law itself indicates that there are certain so-called defense areas. The Administrator, of course, has some discretionary authority, as he should have, and I assume that in the areas where the people feel they would be priority targets, they would make application to the Administrator, and then the Administrator, in working out the number of applications made, based on the priority target data which he would have available, would provide the funds on a matching basis. That is my understanding of the way it would operate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is an emergency appropriation, of course, for the next month and 20 days.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know whether there has yet been worked out the kind of shelter which is appropriate and which could be standardized? Would it not be better to study the question in the over-all 1952 appropriation bill so that we may arrive at a standard? Would not that be beneficial?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I do not know what the answer to the shelter program is. This amount, of course, does not have to be spent, under the terms of the bill, in this fiscal year.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But time is passing; the sands of time may be pretty well running out. We were put on notice in September of 1949 that the Soviet Union had exploded its first atomic weapon. I think it is a matter of public information that since that time Russia has been stockpiling X number of weapons. What that X may be is perhaps subject to some dispute. But it seems to me that every day that passes and every week that passes may be lost time which can never be regained. I would not want to see the program halt until the regular appropriation bill comes before us, and possibly lose 3 months which could never be recovered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are there any appropriations under the current deficiency bill that can be used for studying the program?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I understand there are funds which can be used for studying the program, but there are no funds which could be used for the actual matching where the States or localities have already put up funds to enable them to do some experimenting in this field.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that a complete program has not really been brought forth? The excuse is given that the States, since they have not been provided the funds, have not passed upon the program. But is not this going to be a Federal program, so that the matching, if done, will have to be done so as to satisfy the Federal authorities as to the kind of shelters and as to the places where they shall be built?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Federal authorities will have to establish certain specifications, and, quite properly, they will do so. But we are apt to be in a hopeless type of deadlock if the States say, "We will not go ahead because the Federal Congress has shown no interest in this shelter development"; and then we say, "We will not do anything until the States have gone ahead." We may find ourselves still arguing the point between the States and the Federal Government after the first atomic weapon has fallen upon the United States. That is a responsibility which I personally and as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, do not want to assume. No man is wise enough to say with certainty that tomorrow or a week from today or a month from today, or next year, this country may not be involved in hostilities with a first-class power. We all hope that will not happen, but certainly it seems to me that we have delayed too long in moving ahead with some kind of a sensible civil-defense program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator about starting forward with a sensible civil-defense program. The thing that scares me is that Governor Caldwell tells the Appropriations Committee that it will cost $300,000,000,000 for a full civil-defense shelter program. It involves such a tremendous amount of money that I do not think we have any comprehension of how much it means. While I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to study the best processes, I do not want to take any step that will lead the communities, the States, or the people to believe that the Federal Government is ready to start any $300,000,000,000 program which might, on top of everything else, ruin the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree with the Senator from New Hampshire, who has served as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and who, I think, as much as any Senator on the floor, has been alert to the dangers which could face us from overseas, both in world war III and in the so-called cold war through which we are now going.

I would not want anything I have said on the floor today to be interpreted as indicating that we should go ahead with any $300,000,000,000, $200,000,000,000, or $100,000,000,000 program. I think we must learn how to make use of some of the existing structures in our large cities, perhaps using basements and subbasements, as I previously stated, and possibly making provision for emergency exits from them. But it does seem to me that we should encourage the States and the Federal Government cooperatively to go ahead and try to work out some sensible program which the national economy can support.

While it is true that Mr. Caldwell and other persons testified to what I think is a very fantastic sum, I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire, though he is probably more familiar with the subject than I am, that if, for instance, it were proposed to make the radar defense and Air Force defense of the country so perfect that an absolute guaranty could be given that not a single enemy plane would get across the radar network, or, if they got across, would be shot down 100 percent by the Air Force, we would get a fantastic figure for the Air Force which might run into $200,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000.

Therefore, as a practical matter we must draw a line of balance between what we should do as a matter of common sense and what the economy of the United States can afford. Weighing them together both in our military expenditures and in our civil defense expenditures I think we will have to find a rule of reason.

Therefore, I advocate this amount without any intention that it be considered a precedent for any such figure as has been mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is not the Senator's idea, as the author of the amendment, that it is to be considered as a prelude to any Federal appropriations for the actual construction of shelters? In other words, he does not look on it as the beginning or the prelude, or whatever it might be called, for Federal appropriations for the actual construction of shelters, whether the cost be $1, or $300,000,000,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from New Hampshire that as the author of the amendment I can give him the categorical answer that I certainly do not consider it to be an endorsement or a first step in any such program as mentioned in the $300,000,000,000 testimony before the committee. I would say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I would assume that with the $25,000,000 which would be provided, with some matching from the States, the States could perhaps start to develop some alternative types of shelters which would not entail that kind of vast expenditure, which I do not believe to be practical under all the circumstances.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the statement of facts which the Senator from California has presented, what he proposes is to be done within 2 months before the close of the present fiscal year. Does not the Senator feel that whatever is done should be first considered by the full committee which is in charge of the matter?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my good friend from Tennessee, who has for many years served as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and for whom I have very high regard, that my only reason for not wishing to wait is because, as a matter of fact, as he well knows, sometimes as between the House and the Senate the regular appropriation bills become tied up. I am sure that within his memory, and certainly within my much shorter memory, appropriation bills have gone far beyond the beginning of the fiscal year before being passed. Time may be a very important element I would not wish to say that even a month or 2 months might not be of tremendous importance at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe that an expenditure of such an enormous sum of money should be put into this bill. This is the third supplemental bill. We have had four appropriation bills along this line this year for defense purposes. Is it not too much to ask that the Senate should vote for it at this time? I am surprised that the Senator should want to vote for it himself.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say most respectfully to my colleague from Tennessee that I think it is unfortunate that the appropriation was not included in an earlier bill. I believe we have delayed too long. I hope with all my heart, as I know every other Member of the Senate does, that we may never have to put a single American in a shelter or any kind. I hope we may avoid a war. But we know that the one potential aggressor in the world today has the atomic weapon and that he has been stockpiling atomic weapons for 2 years. We have a very inflammatory situation in Korea. There are possibilities that overnight the situation may spread out. It seems to me that under the conditions in which the world now finds itself we should not de-

lay even for a few months. They may be very important months.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that the House provided $80,000,000 for this item. Five million dollars of it was for so-called organizational equipment. In the Senate committee we made the figure $74,000,000. The appropriation for organizational equipment and other items has been increased to $75,000,000 by the Senator's previous amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House appropriated $75,000,000 as a Federal contribution for building shelters. The Senate committee voted nothing for that purpose, but it was understood that the item of $75,000,000 for shelters and the item of $74,00,000 in the preceding paragraph which has now been raised to $75,000,000, would both go to conference. Therefore, it is possible to have up to $75,000,000 for organizational equipment, research, educational facilities, fire-fighting equipment, and other purposes, and $75,000,000 for building shelters.

The House in its report says:

> Sufficient information is available to enable a start to be made on a survey of existing facilities and where possible to strengthen them to serve as shelter areas.

The report goes on to say:

> When accurate standards for the construction of shelters are available, it can be implemented by additional appropriations. Up to the time of hearings no requests for cooperative improvement of facilities have been received.

If the amendment of the Senator from California prevails there will be a base of $25,000,000 available for Federal contribution for shelters, and a top of $75,000,000. If the Senator's amendment does not prevail there will be a top of $75,000,000 and a base of zero. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is substantially correct. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has served as governor of his State and is familiar with the fact that many of our State legislatures meet biennially, that now legislatures are meeting in a number of States. When we come to the time of the regular appropriation bill being acted on, a good many of the legislatures will have adjourned. The Senate of the United States has the respect of the country. At least I hope and believe it has. If members of State legislatures believe that United States Senators who are more familiar with the grave dangers facing the country, feel that the program is not sufficiently important to make any appropriation for it, it may throw a wet blanket on the program in the various States. To me it would be a very damaging thing to do.

I have no personal interest in the matter. I have discussed it with Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth. I happened to have the privilege on a number of occasions to see both Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and I went to the Nevada tests. I do have some appreciation, as I know other Senators have, too, of the tremendous force with which we are dealing. I most sincerely hope that Senators will at least show that they are sufficiently interested in the subject to give the program a start, and at least take the matter to conference, where, if any doubt should develop, it could be discussed with Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator has mentioned the fact that I served as Governor of my State. I was Governor during the war years. It has always seemed to me that the responsibility of the Federal Government was for guns, tanks, airplanes, ships, and so forth. The primary responsibility for civilian defense must be in the people themselves, at home in the States. The primary start must be made by the people at home. The Federal Government can and must contribute certain things, such as fire-fighting organizations, and that sort of thing. So far as shelters from atom-bomb blasts are concerned, we cannot get 100-percent protection, no matter what we do.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator at that point that I happen to have had some brief experience with civil defense before I went into the Army in World War II. I served as chairman of the Oakland Chapter of the American Red Cross, where we coordinated our efforts in civil defense. As the Senator realizes, however, the great factor which we have today which we did not have in World War II is the atomic weapon. We now know that the potential aggressor in the world has that weapon; and while we hope to be superior in this field, each day that passes, each month that passes, he is building up his stockpile. In order to encourage the States and the localities to move ahead on a program, and in order that we may not dampen their interest in what may be a very crucial thing in the defense of our country, I strongly recommend this appropriation.

Mr. President, I think I have said all I care to say on the subject. I submit the question to the Senate. I am ready for a vote.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In view of the amendment offered by the able Senator from California, I recognize that there is a definite need for research. There is a definite need to commence a program. We know that we could not in any sense give all the cities in every area of the United States adequate protection. However, we must be prepared to protect the strategic centers. If an atomic bomb should unfortunately strike one of our great war plants, it might wipe out all the skilled workers, all the mechanics, and all the tool-makers. We might suffer a very drastic loss if a great war plant should be struck and we should lose all the mechanics, tool-makers, and designers concentrated in that particular city or in that plant area. For that reason I believe that we must get under way with some type of study, research and planning which will protect our great industrial centers, where some of our most important war plants might be located. It is for that reason that I see a necessity for supporting the amendment offered by the able Senator from California.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I was called from the Chamber for a few minutes. I did not understand why the Senator, in offering his amendment, designed it so as to eliminate the item of $5,000,000 which the House proposed for communications.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I discussed that matter with Mr. Wadsworth and Governor Caldwell, and my information from them was that they felt that the funds which they otherwise have would be adequate, and that with regard to that feature, they could await the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask one further question. With respect to States whose legislatures are not in session, and in which there are strategic targets, will they be foreclosed from receiving any allotments under this provision? The language limits the applications for funds to the amount of this appropriation, and to such shelters and protective facilities as can be completed within the limits of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match the contributions hereunder. Will States in which the legislatures are not in session find themselves without any protection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say frankly to the Senator that that is a situation which we would have regardless of what the amount might be. Some of the States may have been slower than others in moving ahead. Some may not have their legislatures in session for another year. However, I know of no other way to proceed. If a State has gone ahead individually and has set up its civil defense program, if it has a national defense area which might be a strategic target, and if it makes an application to the Administrator under the basic act, the Administrator must make allocations depending upon the applications.

Mr. CASE. So far as I can see, there would be nothing to prevent a State from calling a special session of its legislature. As a matter of practical operation, I am wondering if a State which had a strategic war plant and which wanted to take advantage of the provisions of the law, could not call a special session of the legislature. Would there be anything in the operating procedure which would prevent it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but as the author of the amendment, I should hope that in any State where there was a strategic target area, the Administrator would very broadly conceive his duties, so far as he is allowed to do so under the law, so that the governor could be notified to make a prompt request, for example, which would be considered along with the others. I should hope that it would be possible to work out a solution to cover the situation mentioned by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the statement the Senator has made as a part of

the consideration of this amendment, because two States come to my mind where there are strategic targets, and where the legislatures will not normally be in session before 1953.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the author of the amendment, I would certainly hope, and recommend, if there is any equitable arrangement that can be worked out by the Administrator, that he will try to meet that problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, which is referred to in this amendment. It was approved January 12, 1951. It is Public Law 920, of the Eighty-first Congress.

This particular amendment would cut to one-third the amount appropriated by the House language for the particular subject covered by this amendment. The House language provided $75,000,000 for this particular subject. This amendment would provide $25,000,000. It is tied in, of course, with the provision of protective facilities, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. I think the record should show just exactly what subsection (i) provides, because it is very clear to me that it would not permit any program whatsoever, which was far-reaching, extensive, or wasteful to get under way.

While I am speaking of wastefulness, let me say that the Administrator who will handle this activity, Governor Caldwell, is as far from being wasteful as any person we could think of. He is Scotch in every sense of the word. I think he was chosen, among other reasons, for the reason that he is economical and prudent in the expenditure of public funds entrusted to him.

I read that part of subsection (i) which covers this particular activity: "*Provided further*, That financial contributions to the States for shelters and other protective facilities shall be determined by taking the amount of funds appropriated or available to the Administrator for such facilities in each fiscal year and apportioning same among the States in the ratio which the urban population of the critical target areas (as determined by the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense) in each State, at the time of the determination, bears to the total urban population of the critical target areas of all of the States: *Provided further*, That the amounts authorized to be contributed by the Administrator to each State for such shelters and protective facilities shall be equally matched by such State from any source it determines is consistent with its laws and, if not matched within a reasonable time, the Administrator may reallocate same to other States on the formula outlined above: *Provided further*, That the value of any land contributed by any State or political subdivision thereof shall be excluded from the computation of the State share: *Provided further*, That the amounts paid to any State under this subsection shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes set forth herein and in accordance with State civil defense programs or projects approved by the Administrator."

That means that the $25,000,000 would be available in case any State should decide to go ahead promptly in the furnishing of protective facilities at one of the extremely critical target areas, as determined by the Administrator, based upon the advice of the Secretary of Defense. It would mean that the Federal Government, and particularly the Civil Defense Administrator, would not be left helpless and without funds, to pay our part of that particular program, as already outlined in the bill, and which we have entrusted to the Civilian Defense Administrator to carry out.

I do not need to tell the Senate that $25,000,000 will not go far; but it would go a much shorter distance under the provisions of this bill, because the Administrator could not, if he wanted to, allocate it all to one State or to one project, or to one city. He is required to divide it in proportion to the urban population in all of the critical target areas as determined by the Administrator, based on the advice of the Secretary of Defense. That would mean, Mr. President, that in the event the city of New York, the city of San Francisco, the city of Detroit, the city of Chicago, or some other highly critical target area should want to furnish shelter for its most precious records or facilities or for personnel which it felt was most important to be safeguarded, or for any other reason which it felt necessary in order for it to continue to function in case of disaster to put up its own money and a site, because the site would have to be furnished in addition to the local 50 percent of the money, that the Administrator, within the small range which we would give him—that is, that State's part of the appropriation of $25,000,000—could match funds put up by the local or State agencies.

It seems to me the question is whether we meant what we said when we passed the act, and whether we meant what we said when we called in the very fine administrator, who was not asking for any public assignment at all, and his assistant, who happens to be from the other party, who was not asking for any public assignment, to ask them in a bipartisan way to seek to carry out this act which we passed for their guidance and for the safeguarding of the country.

Mr. President, realizing that many legislatures are in session, and that others can be called into session if there is any critical need in any State which does not now have its legislature in session, it seems to me that the least that the Congress can do, operating in good faith and standing back of the commitment which we have made and the offer we have made to the States under this particular subsection of the act which we passed, is to make available some funds out of which the Administrator can proceed to carry out that objective.

In closing, I want to remind the Senate that we have done somewhat the same thing by providing funds with which to build a shelter in this city, in connection with the White House. I am sure that was done in a bipartisan way, just as this program is bipartisan, because it was realized that there was a need, federally speaking, for the making of a shelter at that spot that would be proof against atomic attack.

If any of our great States, or cities, at the critical places which will have to be determined under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, find that something is as critical to them as is this small project in this city, reaching nearly to a million dollars in the District of Columbia, I think we should not withhold the helping hand we have extended to them by the passage of the act, by the inclusion of this particular provision.

I remind Senators again in closing that this is merely one-third of the amount sought to be appropriated and included in the House bill, and it seems to me the Senate should adopt the amendment, and show that we regard this as a serious subject matter, in which we want efforts of the States and cities to protect themselves and their critical installations and personnel to have the degree of Federal help which we have heretofore offered them.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it is necessary to get to the bottom of these requests. Those who appeared on behalf of the Government simply had not themselves the information necessary to present to the committee. I have never seen any request for an appropriation before the Appropriations Committee since I have been a member of it with less information to support it than did this one. I will say for the Administrator, the former Governor of Florida, that he was frank in saying that they did not know what they were going to do with the money; that the committee would have to trust him as to how they spent it. He said that not only to the committee orally, but it appears in his justification. It is all that appears in the justification.

There are three pages which under our practice are supposed to go with every justification for an appropriation. On one of them there is supposed to be set forth the matter by projects, what the money is to be spent for. On another is supposed to be set forth the amount of personnel and the rates of pay, who they are, what they are, what particular type and class of work they do. The last page has to do with the items of expense. All three pages in connection with this request are blank.

Mr. President, the committee, as I followed it, did the only thing it could do in this case, unless the Congress is prepared to write a blank check to Mr. Caldwell for $25,000,000. There is no information as to how the money will be spent. He does not have the information. He has frankly said that studies need to be made that have not yet been made; that engineering examinations will have to be made which have not yet been made; that determinations will have to be made as to what is going to be built in the way of shelters, which determinations have not yet been made; that decisions will have to be made as

to whether there will be shelters as such, or additions to existing buildings, decision which have not yet been made.

Mr. President, the committee recommended in connection with the bill what it thought were adequate funds for the Administrator to go forward and make his studies; have the preliminary work done, prepare for deliveries in the stockpile field for those things which could be secured in connection with the necessities that would arise in the case of bombing attack.

The committee provided as much funds as can now be used for the purchase of firefighting equipment to be distributed throughout the United States. That money is to be matched. I think I can speak for those who voted, as I did, against this item. We took the $1,750,000 appropriation of the House, which we felt should be increased in order that the organizational, the engineering effort, the research effort necessary if we are going to get any results from this program, might be carried forward. We deleted the money the House made available for shelters, for it was clear the money could not now be spent or pledged. Under the strict language of the law, Mr. President, at the present time there could be no grant of any of these funds to any State until the State has had its program approved by the Administrator, and until such approval was also met with sufficient money to pay dollar for dollar the money that might be granted by the Federal Government.

The same section (i) provides that if any other State which might have been a recipient of funds does not have the money and does not furnish it within a reasonable time, together with the necessary plans, and so forth, that the funds which might otherwise go to that State will be reallocated to provident States that have taken the required action.

Many of the State legislatures already have adjourned. What Mr. Caldwell will deem a reasonable time before he makes a reallocation with reference to the States, which have not finished this job—none of them has finished it—and which have not made their preparations, I do not know. If the State legislatures feel that they should not reconvene until they have before them a program on which they can act intelligently, then it might be the full period of time before the next meetings of the legislatures, which, of course, now are 2 years away.

In that event, will the money lie idle in the meantime? Shall we have made an appropriation without having a use for it?

Mr. President, I think the committee fully understands the dangers which confront the Nation in case of war. I believe the committee wishes to do everything it can do to give every possible protection to the civilian population. However, I take it that it is the duty of the committee to try to determine that those who are charged with the expenditure of funds will get a dollar's worth of value for each dollar they expend.

In this case the committee followed the practice it has always followed, namely, when application is made to it for the appropriation of funds, and when those who apply for the appropriation say, "We do not have our plans made, we do not have the engineering plans made, we do not know what we shall do with the money when it is appropriated; but give it to us, and we assure you we will do the best we can with it," then we do not recommend its appropriation, Mr. President.

If the situation were that this money could be used to advantage without any plans and if we could reasonably say that the result would be beneficial, I would say let us give them the $25,000,000 or even give them the staggering sum of $250,000,000, which would be ten times what they request. However, Mr. President, they could not use the $250,000,000 wisely; they could not use the $75,000,000 wisely; they could not use this lesser amount wisely. They must complete their studies and must know what they are doing before we can wisely provide them with these funds.

If we made the appropriations in the present circumstances, if we were to furnish the funds before the public servants were prepared to spend them intelligently, we would invite the type of hurry which would result in nothing being accomplished.

In my opinion, the best service we can render the people of the United States is to make this appropriation only if, as, and when those who are charged with the obligation of spending the funds have plans which the Congress itself can look at and can say that at least the plans have been reasonably worked out and are reasonably suited to carry out the purpose the Congress has in mind when it makes the appropriation.

So, Mr. President, I oppose the appropriation at this time.

I now call attention to what the Administrator himself has said in his justification of estimate. In it he sets forth the objectives of the program, and he very frankly says:

> The engineering profession is not yet able to provide Federal Civil Defense Administration with accurate criteria and standards for the construction of shelters. This is true of every country of which knowledge is available. Thus it is impossible to make an intelligent estimate of per capita cost.
>
> The multiplicity of types of buidings in critical target cities of the United States makes it impossible to set forth clear and comprehensive instructions for modifying or strengthening them to serve as shelter areas. No rule of thumb can apply to more than a very small percentage of buildings in the average American city. In most cases each building will have to be surveyed separately to ascertain what steps must be taken to convert it into an adequate shelter.
>
> A number of reasons make it doubtful that an extended program of new shelter construction—particularly for the single purpose of shelter—should be undertaken. Among these are lack of space in congested city areas, lack of time, and shortage of materials and manpower.

Mr. President, at this point I interpolate that here is a clear statement that the Administrator and those under him do not know even yet what kind of shelter should be built.

I continue the quotation, and I underscore and emphasize this part of it:

> Primary emphasis, therefore, must be placed on determining the types of buildings now feasible as shelters or within which shelter areas could be built. An amount has been included in the operations appropriation for surveys of structures in each of the critical target cities.

Mr. President, we have provided engineering funds in our recommended amount of $75,000,000. We have tried to get this program under way. We have tried to say to the Administrator, in the recommendation, "Get this job done insofar as planning is concerned. Determine what you are going to use the money for, before you divide it among the States. Let the States themselves know what they must do in order to get the money and in order to get adequate value for the money that is spent."

I continue the quotation:

> Also, there will be certain congested areas in critical target cities where adequate modification of existing structures will not be feasible. In these areas a limited program of new construction may be the only means of protecting the people. Research and test projects now being conducted—

I repeat it, Mr. President—

> Research and test projects now being conducted will give us more definite answers to the problems posed by factors Nos. 2 and 3. Until then this Administration will not be able to spell out in every detail the exact purposes for which the needed sum will be spent, nor the exact date by which it may be obligated.

Mr. President, I say that until those data are available your committee cannot make an exact recommendation behind which it can stand, as I see it.

I now read the final statement in the justification of estimate:

> Therefore, to activate a shelter program, certain funds must be allocated to this Administration without particularizing their use; but with the assurance of the Administrator that they will be expended only on projects in accordance with criteria and standards developed through research and test projects.

Mr. President, permit me to say that I have no doubt that the Administrator will do the best job he can do. I was very favorably impressed with the Administrator's honesty and integrity and his desire to make every dollar go as far as it can go; but I was not impressed with the case he could make under the existing circumstances. He did not make the kind of case which would justify our appropriating the money for a capital investment in safety, when the same amount of money, if withheld for a little while, might result in securing 10 times the value to the people of the United States.

Let us remember that this money will be spent only in target areas, in so many target cities in the United States. The money will not be spent in the smaller places or in the county seats and villages. The money will not be spent in the smaller cities; it will not be spent in many of the large cities. The money will be spent in the selected critical areas which the Army says might be targets. Before the money is spent there, let us

be sure that it will do what we want it to do.

Let us spend all the money we need to spend now to educate the populace. Let us do everything we can do to help them prepare themselves; but let us not divide this money among the States, as a grant, when we have no information that the States themselves are prepared to expend it in intelligent safety protection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator has made a very persuasive statement. Let me inquire whether the Administrator gave the committee any idea of when the reports will be available from the engineers who are making the studies.

Mr. CORDON. None; he did not know.

Mr. CASE. Is it not obvious that the Congress will have before it within a reasonable time many additional or supplemental appropriation bills by means of which funds can be provided if the Administrator does come forward with some sound and specific recommendations?

Mr. CORDON. Of course, in connection with the regular appropriation bill which will be before us, for the fiscal year 1952, which will begin as of July 1 of this year, we shall have another opportunity to pass on this matter. The Administrator will have had a further opportunity to go over his entire problem and present it again, as far as that is concerned.

I say again that, as one member of the committee, I want to forward this program as rapidly as it can be done, and done intelligently. I do not want to waste money and, perhaps as a result, instead of increasing and building up enthusiasm and intelligent effort cause despondence and, in the end, utter waste.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the statement which the Senator from Oregon has read from the justification, namely, that within the knowledge of the Administrator, none of these funds may be obligated now. This is a supplemental bill. It is a bill providing funds in the nature of a deficiency for this fiscal year, and it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations acted wisely in applying the rule that no appropriations should be made for the remainder of this fiscal year which the evidence does not show has to be spent during this year or has to be obligated. This money cannot be spent during this fiscal year, it cannot even be obligated, in all probability, and therefore it should not be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment, proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on page 22, line 9. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is the committee amendment the amendment on page 22, to strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated:

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Defense Procurement Fund," on page 23, line 5, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 13, to strike out:

CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND

For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund," $100,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That said fund shall be available only in the event of a proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as provided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.) and shall be expended in accordance with the powers vested in the President and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration by title III of said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XII—Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments", on page 24, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 25, and", and in line 11, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$1,999,045", and insert "$3,103,881."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XIII—General Provisions", on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that concludes all the committee amendments, except one, which was passed over. In view of the lateness of the hour, I think we had better arrange to take that amendment up tomorrow morning. I should now like to offer an amendment comprising two items. The amendment is offered at the request of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

For payment to Vera D. Buchanan, widow of Frank Buchanan, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500.

For payment to Maude F. Kee, widow of John Kee, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, $12,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment passed over is on page 12, relative to the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education. We should like to have that go over until tomorrow, and take it up then. Action on it will complete the committee amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RESERVATION WITH RESPECT TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING CERTAIN STATISTICS OF WAGES AND HOURS OF WORK—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has received a message from the President of the United States recommending a proposed reservation to the convention (No. 63) adopted by the International Labor Conference held at Geneva June 2–22, 1938, concerning the statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture. The Chair is informed that the State Department

H. R. 3587

AN ACT

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 10 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of Revenues of the District of Columbia)

General Administration

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Office of the Corporation Counsel", $5,000; and the limitation under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951 on the amount available for the settlement of claims is increased from "$7,000" to "$12,000".

Fiscal Service

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

For additional amounts for "Collector's Office", fiscal year 1949, $653,568, and fiscal year 1951, $144,700.

Courts

UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "United States courts", $265,443.

Public Welfare

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For additional amounts for "Saint Elizabeths Hospital", fiscal year 1949, $13,704, and fiscal year 1950, $22,604.

Settlement of Claims and Suits

For an additional amount for the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in ac-

1 cordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11,
2 1929, as amended (46 Stat. 500), $7,493.

3 JUDGMENTS

4 For the payment of final judgments rendered against
5 the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Document
6 Numbered 67 (82d Congress), together with such further
7 sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceed-
8 ing 4 per centum per annum on such judgments, as provided
9 by law, from the date the same became due until the date
10 of payment, $5,580.

11 AUDITED CLAIMS

12 For an additional amount for the payment of claims,
13 certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District
14 of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which
15 have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the
16 District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title
17 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1948
18 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in House Document Num-
19 bered 67 (82d Congress), $4,648.

20 CHAPTER II

21 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

22 (1)*SENATE*

23 (2)*For payment to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Junior, son,*
24 *and Barbara Vandenberg Bailey and Elizabeth Vandenberg*

Pfeiffer, daughters, of Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $12,500.

(3) *CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE*

For an additional amount for "Furniture and repairs", $17,878.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(4) *For payment to Vera D. Buchanan, widow of Frank Buchanan, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500.*

(5) *For payment to Maude F. Kee, widow of John Kee, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, $12,500.*

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", $1,000, to remain available until expended.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For an additional amount, for liquidation of contract authority, for the House and Senate improvements authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the Acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472), Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), and

1 the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, $268,000,
2 of which $168,000 shall be available for the House improve-
3 ments and $100,000 for the Senate improvements.

4 For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings",
5 $3,000.

6 (6) *SENATE RESTAURANTS*

7 *For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor*
8 *and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to pro-*
9 *vide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Build-*
10 *ing, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the*
11 *supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Adminis-*
12 *tration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes,*
13 *as amended, $30,000.*

14 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

15 For an additonal amount for "House office buildings",
16 including furniture and furnishings, $21,500.

17 (7) *GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE*

18 *WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND*
19 *BINDING*

20 *For an additional amount for "Working capital and con-*
21 *gressional printing and binding", $1,200,000: Provided,*
22 *That the limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch*
23 *Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for the*
24 *printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register*
25 *in accordance with the Act approved July 26, 1935 (44*

1 *U. S. C. 301–310), is increased from "$475,000" to*
2 *"$675,000".*

3 CHAPTER III

4 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

5 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

6 For an additional amount for "American sections, inter-
7 national commissions", $36,500, which shall be derived by
8 transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to inter-
9 national organizations"; and appropriations granted under
10 this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available to enable
11 the President to perform the obligations of the United States
12 under the treaty between the United States of America and
13 Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the
14 United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

15 INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL
16 ACTIVITIES

17 For an additional amount for "International information
18 and educational activities", for facilities for radio transmis-
19 sion and reception, and so forth, as authorized in the third
20 proviso under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation
21 Act, 1951, $9,533,939, to remain available until expended;
22 and the limitation contained in said proviso is increased from
23 "$41,288,000" to "$50,821,939".

1 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

2 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

4 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
5 general legal activities", $30,000.

6 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
9 (8)~~$6,147,000~~ *$5,872,000*; and appropriations granted
10 under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for
11 the purchase of seven hundred passenger motor vehicles in
12 addition to those heretofore provided.

13 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

15 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
16 Bureau of Prisons", (9)~~$125,000~~ *$449,000.*

17 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

18 For an additional amount for "Support of United
19 States prisoners", $139,000.

20 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

21 For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities",
22 $1,380,000, for replacement of the power and heating

1 plants of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia:
2 *Provided,* That the limitation under this head in the Depart-
3 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1951, on the cost of
4 completion of the replacement of a power plant at the
5 United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, is repealed.

6 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

7 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

8 CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

9 For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport
10 Act", $1,464,384, to remain available until June 30, 1953,
11 as follows: Visalia Municipal Airport, Visalia, California,
12 $40,277; Gainesville Municipal Airport, Gainesville, Florida,
13 $9,467; Waycross-Ware County Airport, the city of Way-
14 cross and Ware County, Georgia, $55,417; Harding Field,
15 the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $140,650; New
16 Orleans Airport, Orleans Levee District and the Orleans
17 Airport Commission, Louisiana, $257,237; Laurence G.
18 Hanscom Field, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, $91,-
19 528; English Field, Amarillo, Texas, $29,590; Rio Grande
20 Valley International Airport, Brownsville, Texas, $384,161;
21 Eaker Airfield, Durant, Oklahoma, $359,580; Jefferson
22 County Airport, Jefferson County, Texas, $40,593; and the
23 Draughon-Miller Municipal Airport, Temple, Texas,
24 $55,884: *Provided,* That no request for reimbursement of

the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952 of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair.

(10)~~CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD~~

~~CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

~~For an additional amount for "Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses", $25,000.~~

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, departmental", $450,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FIELD

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, field", $70,000.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

TONGASS FOREST HIGHWAYS, ALASKA

For surveys, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authorization granted by section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, $750,000, to remain available until expended.

THE JUDICIARY

Other Courts and Services

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Fees of commissioners", $25,000.

FEES OF JURORS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", $200,000.

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Bureau of the Mint

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $130,000.

Coast Guard

(11)~~OPERATING EXPENSES~~

~~For an additonal amount for "Operating expenses", $1,000,000.~~

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements", $350,000, to remain available until expended.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

Postal Operations

For an additional amount for "Postal operations", (12)~~$7,500,000~~ *$15,000,000.*

Transportation of Mails

For an additional amount for "Transportation of mails", for payment of increased rates to railroad carriers for 1951 and prior fiscal years, in accordance with Interstate Commerce Commission Order of December 4, 1950 (Docket Numbered 9200), $152,000,000.

Field Service, Post Office Department

OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Clerks, First- and Second-Class Post Offices

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Clerks, first- and second-class post offices", $150,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Clerks, third-class post offices, 1947".

1 OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

2 Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service

3 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Rail-
4 road transportation and mail messenger service", $200,000,
5 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Domestic
6 air mail service, 1948".

7 CHAPTER V

8 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

9 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

10 EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND

11 For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation
12 fund", $3,000,000.

13 (13)*FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY*

14 *OFFICE OF EDUCATION*

15 *GRANTS FOR SURVEYS AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION*

16 *For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and*
17 *school construction", to remain available until expended,*
18 *$50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of*
19 *Education determines to be necessary shall be available for*
20 *urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the*
21 *President to be critical areas by reason of national defense*
22 *activities: Provided, That appropriations and contract au-*
23 *thorizations heretofore granted under this head, shall also be*
24 *available to enable the Commissioner to provide school facili-*

ties pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815).

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(14)*Control of Forest Pests*

FOREST PEST CONTROL ACT

For an additional amount for "Forest Pest Control Act", $345,000.

Forest Service

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For an additional amount for "Forest development roads and trails", (15)~~$3,000,000~~ *$5,800,000,* to remain available until expended.

Commodity Credit Corporation

The limitation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$16,350,000" to "$19,100,000".

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Commission of Fine Arts

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $2,000.

1 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

2 CONSTRUCTION

3 For an additional amount for "Construction", $3,650,-
4 000, to remain available until expended.

5 (16)*BUREAU OF MINES*

6 *CONSTRUCTION*

7 *For an additional amount for "Construction", $350,000,*
8 *to remain available until expended.*

9 TERRITORIES AND ISLAND POSSESSIONS

10 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

11 For an additional amount for "Construction, Alaska
12 Railroad", (17)~~$1,000,000~~ *$4,500,000*, to remain avail-
13 able until expended.

14 CHAPTER VIII

15 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

16 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

17 ANNUITIES, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WIDOWS

18 For payment of annuities as authorized by the Act of
19 August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465), $204,500.

20 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

21 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

22 The amount authorized to be transferred from the ap-
23 propriation granted under this head in the Supplemental
24 Appropriation Act, 1951, to the appropriation "Operating

1 expenses", for the reactivation of industrial plants, is increased
2 from "$14,000,000" to "$26,000,000".

3 EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

4 Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal
5 year 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and
6 improvements to public buildings under the control of the
7 General Services Administration.

8 (18) *OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER*

9 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

10 *The amount made available under this head in the*
11 *Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the*
12 *payment of terminal leave is changed from "$2,000,000" to*
13 *"$1,000,000".*

14 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

15 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

16 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
17 sions", $26,618,000, to remain available until expended.

18 AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR DISABLED
19 VETERANS

20 To enable the Administrator to provide, or assist in pro-
21 viding, automobiles or other conveyances for disabled vet-
22 erans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950
23 (Public Law 798), $800,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

2 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

3 MARITIME TRAINING

4 The limitation under the head "Maritime training",
5 United States Maritime Commission, in the Independent
6 Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available
7 for administrative personal services and so forth is increased
8 from "$2,477,000" to "$2,532,000".

9 VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

10 For working capital for the "Vessel Operations Revolv-
11 ing Fund", which is hereby created for the purpose of carry-
12 ing out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Com-
13 merce, including charter, operation, maintenance, repair, re-
14 conditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the
15 jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, $20,000,000, to
16 remain available until expended.

17 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for
18 shipping services rendered under said Fund shall be pre-
19 scribed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Fund shall
20 be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities
21 conducted thereunder: *Provided,* That the provisions of sec-
22 tions 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) and 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-
23 eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be appli-
24 cable in connection with such operations and to seamen
25 employed through general agents as employees of the United

1 States, who may be employed in accordance with customary
2 commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwith-
3 standing the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the
4 employment of persons by the United States: *Provided fur-*
5 *ther*, That such sums as may be determined to be necessary
6 by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the
7 Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 per centum of
8 vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this Fund
9 to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes
10 of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating
11 functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as
12 stated therein: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any
13 other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any
14 working funds or of allocation accounts established, subse-
15 quent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for
16 under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore
17 and hereafter received from such activities, may be trans-
18 ferred to and consolidated with this Fund, which shall be
19 available for the purposes of such working funds or allo-
20 cation accounts.

21 (19)~~No money appropriated by this or any other Act may~~
22 ~~be used for the payment to the owner on account of the~~
23 ~~purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States~~
24 ~~is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United~~
25 ~~States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United~~

1 ~~States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated~~
2 ~~cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent~~
3 ~~to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the~~
4 ~~case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted~~
5 ~~pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant~~
6 ~~Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall~~
7 ~~not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of~~
8 ~~March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of~~
9 ~~capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to~~
10 ~~such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide~~
11 ~~purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed~~
12 ~~the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such pur-~~
13 ~~chaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal~~
14 ~~Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United~~
15 ~~States is chartered or taken for use by the United States,~~
16 ~~the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall~~
17 ~~not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted~~
18 ~~under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were~~
19 ~~purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the~~
20 ~~preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with~~
21 ~~the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue~~
22 ~~for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such~~
23 ~~schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5~~
24 ~~per centum per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of~~
25 ~~any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the~~

~~Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.~~

(20)*Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude payment of an amount for any vessel or the use thereof in any case in which such amount shall have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be just compensation therefor.*

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Functions, Department of the Army

THE PANAMA CANAL

CIVIL GOVERNMENT

For an additional amount for "Civil government", $72,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal."

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

(21)~~NIAGARA POWER DEVELOPMENT~~

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT REMEDIAL WORKS

INVESTIGATION

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the

1 treaty between the United States of America and Canada,
2 signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States
3 Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until ex-
4 pended, $450,000, to be derived by transfer from the ap-
5 propriation "Flood control, general".

6 CHAPTER X

7 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

8 INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK

9 To enable the President, during the fiscal year 1951,
10 to carry out the provisions of title V of the Foreign
11 Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 209), relating
12 to international children's welfare work, (22)~~$5,000,000~~
13 *$7,500,000.*

14 CHAPTER XI

15 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

16 EXPENSES OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION

17 For an additional amount for "Expenses of defense
18 production", (23)~~$33,029,000~~ *$27,331,895*: *Provided*, That
19 appropriations under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall
20 be available for rental of buildings or parts thereof in the Dis-
21 trict of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations,
22 and improvements necessary for the proper use by the Gov-
23 ernment, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30,
24 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a): *Provided further,*

1 That the appropriation to the President for Emergencies
2 (National Defense) shall be reimbursed from funds con-
3 tained herein for allocations made therefrom to any agency
4 of the Government for carrying out the provisions of the
5 Defense Production Act of 1950 after March 31, 1951:
6 *Provided further*, That the aggregate of borrowings from
7 the Treasury pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense
8 Production Act of 1950 which may be outstanding at any
9 one time is increased from "$600,000,000" to "$1,600,-
10 000,000": *Provided further*, That any appropriation to any
11 department, agency, or corporation, in the executive branch
12 of the Government, for salaries and expenses, shall be avail-
13 able (24) *by transfer or otherwise* for the discharge of re-
14 sponsibilities, relating to the national defense, assigned to such
15 department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law
16 (25)~~: *Provided further,* That the appropriation "Expenses~~
17 ~~of Defense Production" may be increased by transfer of not to~~
18 ~~exceed $1,834,000 of funds appropriated for the fiscal year~~
19 ~~1951 to the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior,~~
20 ~~Labor, and the General Services Administration for the pur-~~
21 ~~pose of carrying out the duties and responsibilities assigned~~
22 ~~to these agencies under provisions of the Defense Production~~
23 ~~Act of 1950~~.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Federal Civil Defense Administration

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including purchase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; (26)*security guard services;* and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; (27)~~$1,750,000: *Provided,* That $110,000 shall be available for providing civil defense communications systems pursuant to subsection (c) of section 201 of said Act~~ *$75,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952.*

(28)~~FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS~~

~~For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided,* That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further,* That the Administrator shall not approve~~

~~any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.~~

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement fund", which is hereby established for the purpose of financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of materials or organizational equipment for which financial contributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made on a matching basis by subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, (29)~~$5,000,000~~ *$10,000,000.* Said fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said materials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance, or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

(30)~~CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND~~

~~For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund", $100,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided,* That said fund shall be available only in the event of a~~

~~proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as provided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress) and shall be expended in accordance with the powers vested in the President and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration by title III of said Act.~~

CHAPTER XII

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in (31)*Senate Document Numbered 25, and* House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-second Congress, (32)~~$1,999,045~~ *$3,103,881,* together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Pro-*

1 *vided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid
2 until it shall have become final and conclusive against the
3 United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise:
4 *Provided further,* That, unless otherwise specifically required
5 by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever
6 appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than
7 thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

8 CHAPTER XIII

9 GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 (33)*Sec. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in*
11 *this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any*
12 *corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the*
13 *salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against*
14 *the Government of the United States or who is a member of*
15 *an organization of Government employees that asserts the*
16 *right to strike against the Government of the United States,*
17 *or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that*
18 *advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United*
19 *States by force or violence: Provided, That for the purposes*
20 *hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence*
21 *that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the*
22 *provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the*

1 *Government of the United States, is not a member of an*
2 *organization of Government employees that asserts the right*
3 *to strike against the Government of the United States, or*
4 *that such person does not advocate, and is not a member*
5 *of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Gov-*
6 *ernment of the United States by force or violence: Provided*
7 *further, That any person who engages in a strike against the*
8 *Government of the United States or who is a member of an*
9 *organization of Government employees that asserts the right*
10 *to strike against the Government of the United States, or*
11 *who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that*
12 *advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United*
13 *States by force or violence and accepts employment the*
14 *salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation*
15 *or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and,*
16 *upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or*
17 *imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: Provided*
18 *further, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition*
19 *to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of*
20 *existing law: Provided further, That, as applicable to the*
21 *Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this sec-*
22 *tion shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person*
23 *employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work*

1 *involving the loss of human life or destruction of property,*
2 *and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such*
3 *persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered*
4 *in such emergency without execution of the affidavit con-*
5 *templated by this section.*
6 (34) *SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the*
7 *Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in*
8 *hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security*
9 *Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial*
10 *assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated*
11 *to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act*
12 *of 1948, as amended, or any other Act to provide economic*
13 *or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to*
14 *foreign countries, to any country which exports or know-*
15 *ingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet*
16 *Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including*
17 *Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or*
18 *armament or military matériel or articles or commodities*
19 *which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the*
20 *Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration*
21 *may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or*
22 *military matériel; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby*
23 *authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator*

1 *of the Economic Cooperation Administration any article or*
2 *commodity of the nature or class described.*
3 *(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation*
4 *Act, 1951 is hereby repealed.*
5 SEC. (35)~~1302~~ *1303.* This Act may be cited as the
6 "Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951".

Passed the House of Representatives April 10, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments May 10 (legislative day, May 2), 1951.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 10 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

Calendar No. 281

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 9 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KEM (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MALONE) to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 26, between lines 20 and 21, insert a new
2 section as follows:
3 "SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the
4 Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged
5 in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security
6 Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial
7 assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated
8 to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act
9 of 1948, as amended, or any other Act to provide economic
10 or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to
11 foreign countries, to any country which exports or know-

1 ingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet
2 Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including
3 Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or
4 armament or military matériel or articles or commodities
5 which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the
6 Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration
7 may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or
8 military matériel; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby
9 authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator
10 of the Economic Cooperation Administration any article or
11 commodity of the nature or class described.

12 "(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation
13 Act, 1951 is hereby repealed."

14 On page 26, line 21, strike out "SEC. 1302." and insert
15 "SEC. 1303."

Calendar No. 281

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3587

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KEM (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MALONE) to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

MAY 9 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

fundamental questions to the attention of my much wiser and more experienced colleagues. I know that there are a number of distinguished Senator on the other side of the aisle who are closely associated with the persons who are directing America's foreign policy. I am sure that if they know what is behind the fantastic gyrations now evident in our foreign policy, they will speak up and give us the answers. I will go even further and say humbly that I consider it their duty to do so. Up to now I must admit that I have not heard any plausible explanation given.

Before I continue further in my brief remarks I should like to assure the Senate that the people of Maryland are asking for objective serious answers to their questions. They deplore the turn some of the debate has taken recently. They are disturbed over the name calling and the language being used. They are angered by the selfish partisan attitude of some.

In this respect I might remind my auditors that the junior Senator from Maryland comes from a State that has a large majority of its voters registered as Democrats.

So, to the people of my State, this is not an issue to be scrabbled and twisted for political advantage. It is a matter of life and death to their sons, husbands, and sweethearts. It is a matter of life and death to their country.

I shall state a few of the questions, but before doing so Mr. President, may I ask the indulgence of the Senate that I be not interrupted until I have finished these few remarks? Since they will be couched in the form of questions, I am asking any Senators who care to answer them to wait until I have finished, since my queries are all interrelated.

Mr. President, on June 1, 1950, at a press conference, President Truman spoke about peace. The Baltimore Sun of the next day carried an account of the Chief Executive's memorable statement. The headlines read:

Truman says he does not expect war—asserts permanent peace is nearer now than in last 5 years.

The article is written by Joseph H. Short, who is now, as Senators know, the President's press-relations man. The article reads:

WASHINGTON, June 1.—President Truman said today he does not expect war.

In fact, the Chief Executive told his weekly news conference the world is closer now to permanent peace than at any time during the last 5 years.

These cheerful Presidential comments were made on a recent public-opinion poll indicating that a majority of the American people expect war within the next 5 years.

Mr. Truman said he does not agree with that opinion at all, adding that he is doing everything possible to prevent any war of any kind.

WORKING THROUGH UN

The United States, the President continued, is working through the United Nations for a permanent peace, which he said is nearer realization than at any time in 5 years.

Mr. Truman's impromptu remarks came only a few hours after—

1. His request to Congress for $1,222,500,000 for military aid to friendly nations during the fiscal year beginning next month.

2. A statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee by Louis A. Johnson, Defense Secretary, that the President was solidly behind a 3-year extension of the draft law.

STRENGTH ESSENTIAL

At the news conference the Chief Executive did not explain away the seeming contradiction between his comments on peace and his appeals to Congress, but on many previous occasions he has stated his belief that an essential ingredient to peace is the military strength of the United States and its allies.

In this case Mr. Truman appeared on the verge of saying more on the subject when he was interrupted with a question concerning the impending expiration of Presidential powers to suspend the import tax on copper.

A moment or two later, when other reporters returned him to the larger subject, he referred them to speeches made on his recent nonpolitical tour to Grand Coulee Dam, especially one made at Laramie, Wyo., on May 9.

LONG TASK AHEAD

He said he thought he had made it plain at Laramie, in the University of Wyoming auditorium, that he anticipated the achievement of peace.

"All our international policies, taken together," the President declared at Laramie, "form a program designed to strengthen and unite the free world in its resistance to the spread of communism.

"They are aimed at banding the free countries together in a great demonstration that the free way of life is more rewarding to the individual than any form of tyranny, old or new.

"I say again that we have a long task ahead. It may be many years before we can be sure that communism is no longer a threat, that our goals of stability and peace have been attained."

THREE-FOURTHS PRODUCTION

"But those goals are clearly within our reach. The non-Communist nations together have two-thirds of the world's people and three-fourths of the world's productive power.

"And we have much more than mere quantity or mere strength. We have the greatest attraction of all—human freedom. Our system of life satisfies the most fundamental desire of man—the opportunity to be his own master.

"We can have faith that with these qualities, and the help of the Almighty, we will attain a just and lasting peace throughout the world."

MORE SPECIFIC ON THREAT

Although the President indicated that he was saying the same thing today as on previous occasions, he certainly was more specific about the absence of a threat of war. The question which prompted his comments referred to war within 5 years but Mr. Truman's reply was general and without any time limitation.

On May 4, at another news conference, he had declared himself as not alarmed over the world situation, adding that prospects were brighter than in 1946, which he set down as the lowest point of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

On June 27 at 12 noon, just 26 days later, President Truman ordered our Armed Forces into Korea to fight a war that is costing us 1,400 casualties a week.

Mr. President, the people of Maryland demand to know what kind of a foreign policy the Government of the United States is following that can bring about such a tragedy?

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that President Truman in his press interview spoke of permanent peace. The Baltimore Sun is recognized as one of the leading newspapers in the State of Maryland. I do not believe the Sun would deliberately misquote the President of the United States. I do not believe its reporters are so grossly inaccurate that the President's statements were distorted out of meaning.

I do not recall that the President has ever denied he said we were closer to permanent peace than we had been in the past 5 years.

What does it mean when the Chief Executive of our country in one breath tells us we have peace in our grasp and then plunges us into war with his next order?

The people of Maryland want that question answered. I think it is a fair question. I think it is an important one.

Here is another question: What kind of a foreign policy are we pursuing that calls for taking our troops out of Korea one day and on another day rushing them back into the same place without consulting the Congress or the American people?

What kind of foreign policy is it that keeps our Seventh Fleet busy giving our Ground Forces tactical assistance while the same fleet is being used to neutralize the Chinese troops on Formosa that could take the pressure off our own troops?

The junior Senator from Maryland has been listening carefully to the debates on the Senate floor and has heard it said time and time again that this country is pledged to fight aggression at any place in the world where it rears its ugly head.

Let us remember that that was the basic argument for sending our troops to Europe. Aggression threatened, it was said. We must rush to meet it. We must not let it spread.

I thought that was plausible. I have never been against sending troops to Europe. Certainly I voted to uphold the Constitution and to retain the war-making powers in the hands of Congress, but I also voted to send four divisions to Europe, and I will vote to send more if the need is shown.

However, the people of Maryland want to know what kind of a foreign policy it is that rushes troops to meet a threatened aggression in Europe while it is providing a sanctuary for aggressors on the Korean peninsula.

Let me read a short excerpt from the censored transcript of the hearings now being held before the Joint Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations:

General MACARTHUR. As soon as we realized that the Chinese were moving across the Yalu in force as national entities, I ordered the bridge across the Yalu bombed from the Korean side, half-way to the stream. That order was countermanded from Washington, and it was only when I protested violently that I was allowed to continue my original directive.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, are the forces in Korea at the present time permitted to bomb half of the bridge from the center of the river over to North Korea?

General MACARTHUR. When I left they were; yes, sir; and I was bombing them.

The CHAIRMAN. Those people have had some good experience in pinpoint bombing, I assume.

General MACARTHUR. The original order, General Whitney just recalled to me, directed me to confine the bombing along the Yalu River to 5 miles within North Korea, from the Yalu border—from the border of North Korea 5 miles inland, I was not permitted to bomb. That was changed, as I say, when, on my recommendation.

Mr. President, what kind of a foreign policy is it that tells one of our generals conducting a war that they cannot even bomb the enemy if they move 5 miles into the territory the general has been ordered to defend?

What kind of a foreign policy is it that orders our generals not to bomb supply depots and supply lines from which the enemy is drawing the strength with which to kill our American boys?

What are we doing in Korea anyway? Are we fighting a war or playing a macabre game?

Finally, what kind of a foreign policy is it that orders our generals to move our troops up and down a tiny peninsula 10,000 miles away from home while thousands upon thousands of American soldiers are butchered?

What kind of a foreign policy is it that has brought such hopeless misery down upon us?

Mr. President, I have tried to be objective because I know that the people of my State would not have me be otherwise. Knowing them as I do, I am confident their only desire is that the Senate, after debate and in conjunction with the House of Representatives, formulate a foreign policy that will correct some of the incongruities so abundantly apparent in the policy we have been pursuing.

I stand ready at this time of uncertainty and great peril to our Nation to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the formulation of such a policy to the best of my ability.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Senator from Maryland give the date when the President issued the statement that "We are nearer peace than at any time in the last 5 years?"

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That statement was issued on June 1, 1950.

Mr. MARTIN. When did American troops go into Korea?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They went into Korea on June 27, 1950, just 26 days later.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Senator realize that intelligence information as to the movement of troops of nations which might be in opposition to the United States is information which should have come from our State Department, and the President should have known of the dangers in Korea when he issued his famous peace statement?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am advised that at that time there were in the hands of the President of the United States intelligence reports which would have indicated to the contrary of what he stated.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Should not that information have been given to the people of the United States, so that they would not have been taken with such terrible surprise when we were attacked in Korea?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I would have thought so, but apparently the President decided to the contrary, if he had the information.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has made a very able presentation and has asked some important questions which should be answered. I am not in a position to answer them, but there should be in the State Department or in the Department of Defense officials who can answer those questions, and the American people have a right to have them answered.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am completely satisfied that the people of my State and, I think, all the people of our great Nation, want to know the answers to those questions; and I know that, with the answers to those questions, they want laid down a more definite and distinct foreign policy which the Congress and the people can follow.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, is it not true that it is impossible to have a policy for the conduct of a military campaign unless the country carrying on the campaign has a plan of procedure which all understand and with which all are in accord?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes, I certainly think that it would be an absolute ingredient of the conduct of any war that the people have sufficient information of the policies and plan of procedure to enable them to be solidly behind the effort and to keep solidly behind it.

Mr. MARTIN. A moment ago the Senator from Maryland compared the situation in Korea to a football game. Of course there are some great football teams in Maryland. If a football player was making a punt and if the coach or someone else in authority prevented the ends on the team from covering the kick, the results would not be very satisfactory, would they?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is perfectly true. A somewhat similar policy is now being followed in Korea, I am sorry to say.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maryland deserves great credit for propounding the questions set forth in his remarks, and I hope that someone in the State Department or in the Department of Defense will answer them for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment on page 12, beginning in line 10, striking out in line 15 the numerals "50,000,000", and inserting "$100,000,000."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Millikin
Anderson	Green	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Moody
Benton	Hendrickson	Morse
Brewster	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Humphrey	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Duff	Lodge	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	McClellan	Tobey
Ellender	McFarland	Underwood
Ferguson	McKellar	Welker
Flanders	McMahon	Wherry
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] have been appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of Hon. John Kee, late a Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia, and are, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, because of the inadaquate appropriations to meet the needs of schools, under the terms of Public Law 815, enacted by the Congress on September 23, 1950, the Office of Education had to establish a priority system

in the allotment of the insufficient funds to meet the applications submitted to them by school districts throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, the Congress authorized a program whereby the Federal Government would participate in the construction of school buildings in areas in which the scholastic population had been increased by reason of the expansion of defense industry or operation in the immediate area. When Congress did that, it recognized a basic responsibility of Government. It held out to those charged with the responsibility of operating the schools in such areas the indication, in fact, Mr. President, the positive assurance, that it would participate in the required expansion of the school facilities in the respective areas.

The present school year is drawing to a close. Another school year will begin in the fall. Those charged with operation of the districts wherein increased numbers of youth are to have their opportunity for an education must know not only what the assistance available to them will be, but they certainly are entitled to have the children in their districts assured that reasonable provision will be made for school plans and school equipment which will give them the opportunity for the kind of education the American people want their youth to have.

Mr. President, in the last appropriation by the Congress $46,500,000 was made available, but of this amount $15,000,000 was reserved to construct school facilities on military reservations. The remaining $31,000,000 was sufficient to make only partial allotments to 70 schools in the United States.

Mr. President, hundreds of school districts in the United States are immobilized in varying degrees by reason of the inadequacy of school buildings and school equipment. They are awaiting the provision of the necessary funds by local school districts and the Federal Government. When we authorized the program, Mr. President, we said that the Federal Government would meet its responsibilities in that regard. It is doing so, but on the installment plan. It seems that the spirit of the orders of those who are charged with the reduction of credit, by which they are shortening the time for the completion of the installment payments, is not being followed out by those who have the responsibility for carrying out the program. In this instance the installments, instead of being accelerated and speeded up, are being slowed down, and they have now almost stopped.

Mr. President, the Federal Government should not take the attitude that it will compel the youth of our country who are affected by the program to suffer the penalty of inadequate educational facilities, while waiting for the Government to make up its mind as to when it will meet the responsibility which exists and which it has recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Oklahoma in the amendment which he has submitted. However, I do not believe it goes far enough to meet the needs. I should like to say that, as I understand, the provision will affect only the small number of school districts in the country that reach the priority status which has been established by the Department of Education.

If the rules permitted, I would ask that this proposal be increased to meet the real needs of a very acute situation.

Mr. President, in this field of education the Federal Government has a responsibility. It is just as great a responsibility as the furnishing of uniforms for soldiers. The problem, as it affects my State, is that many acres of land have been taken off the county tax rolls. In my State every county which has within it a large military or defense operation and whose population has been greatly increased has raised its tax rate to the maximum limit permitted by the State constitution. Three years would be required under the constitution of Kentucky, to amend it in order to meet the new obligation.

Mr. President, 10 Kentucky school districts had applications on file with the Office of Education on March 12, 1951, under Public Law 815. The applications disclose that there has been an increase of 3,400 pupils in the 10 districts since the 1938–39 school year, and that there are at present 8,578 unhoused school children, children for whom adequate school housing is not available, in those areas.

Although these 10 districts have an estimated entitlement of $2,160,429 under Public Law 815, they have asked the Federal Government for only $1,773,164 and have proposed to supply themselves $946,362 in local funds to provide this needed school housing.

These 10 districts are outside of the Paducah-MacCracken County Atomic project area. In the atomic project area itself, where there are 11 city and county school districts, it is estimated that additional classroom space for an influx of 6,665 children will be required during the period of construction of the atomic plant. Temporary facilities will suffice for an estimated 3,030 of these children, but permanent classroom space must be provided for the remaining 3,625, since it is estimated that number will become permanent residents, requiring permanent facilities.

School systems in the atomic project area already have felt the impact of the steadily increasing activity at the atomic plant site. Employment at the site began in large numbers this spring and the affected districts will be unable to qualify for the current year. By fall the shortage of schoolroom space will be acute.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that all of the twenty-odd affected Kentucky school districts are doing their utmost to care for their new pupils. School boards, in all but one of these districts, have levied the constitutional maximum tax—$1.50 per hundred dollar property valuation—for school purposes. The tax rate in the other district is $1.45, only 5 cents under the maximum.

Mr. KERR. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for having brought to the attention of the Senate the details of the specific problem as it exists in his State. He asks whether the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators who have been so kind as to join him would not still leave much of the Government's responsibilities unmet and uncared for. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that unless the money is appropriated in the deficiency bill it will be impossible to get any relief for next year's school term, although the pupil load in the defense areas created by the Government is constantly growing greater?

Mr. KERR. That is exactly correct. The schools are bulging, and their needs are growing greater all the time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the bill which authorizes the expenditures was drawn up as a result of a whole summer's study by one of the finest subcommitees of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House. The members of the subcommittee visited the localities. They examined the school plants. They considered the student load. They saw the unhealthy and dangerous fire traps which pupils were using at the various defense installations.

After a thorough and complete study, a report was made, and the authorization was voted. Congress determined that it should not be a part of the Government's policy to short-change the children of the defense workers who are brought into an area to do a patriotic job by providing for such children less than a half day of school, under dangerous fire trap conditions, in unhealthy surroundings, and faced with completely inadequate facilities to handle the school requirements. Congress accepted the obligation by the passage of the authorization legislation. It is up to us now to take action about it. It will not help the students to put off for a year the beginning of the construction of the schools.

Mr. KERR. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. KERR. I shall yield in a moment. First, I wish to say that if we were discussing food for soldiers, Congress would not hesitate to provide it as it was needed. If it were housing, Mr. President, we would not hesitate to provide it as it was currently needed; it would be unfair not to respond. It is nearly as unfair an imposition on school children to say to them, "While you are in your first, second, third, or eighth grade, you are going to be permitted to have the opportunity to attend school only half the time, because the great United States Government, while it has recognized its primary responsibility to help provide an educational plant to take care of you, is busy elsewhere."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma how much the Bureau of the Budget recommended.

Mr. KERR. It recommended $50,000,000, which is the amount carried in the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. How much is the Senator asking for?

Mr. KERR. $100,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, together with several other Senators, and we attempt to justify appropriations. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator whether he has in his possession any new evidence which was not presented to the Bureau of the Budget or to the Committee on Appropriations. As to the responsibility of the Government in that respect, I agree with the Senator, but granting that everything the Senator from Oklahoma has said is true with respect to the authorization, the item was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, the presentation was made by the Bureau of the Budget on the basis of $50,000,000, and that is the amount which the Committee on Appropriations has allowed. The evidence which was submitted to the committee was up-to-the-minute evidence, because it came to the Senate committee after the House had passed the bill. The House had not considered the item at all.

The item was covered in a recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The Bureau of the Budget looked over the entire situation, and recommended to Congress that the amount be fixed at $50,000,000; and the President agrees with the figure, because the Budget Bureau is his agency.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. KERR. I should first like to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to review my question. I am sure the Senator will agree about the procedure, but does he have any new evidence which was not presented to the Bureau of the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, bearing in mind that the Committee on Appropriations handled the matter about 2 or 3 days ago?

Mr. KERR. I do not know whether I have any new evidence which the very effective Committee on Appropriations did not have before it. However, I have evidence which I think is compelling and persuasive and which I will now give to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it evidence in addition to evidence presented by the Bureau of the Budget? That is what I am asking about.

Mr. KERR. I assume this particular evidence was submitted to the committee. I do not know whether I have any evidence other than the evidence which was considered by the committee. I would remind the Senator from Nebraska that although he says the Bureau of the Budget recommended not more than $50,000,000, I take the position that what they said may be interpreted as meaning that they recommended not less than $50,000,000. As I understand, they recommended $50,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me correct the Senator's statement. The Budget Bureau recommended an appropriation of $50,000,000.

Mr. KERR. That is what I understood.

Mr. WHERRY. That was based upon evidence submitted by the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. KERR. In his remarks the Senator from Nebraska stated that the Budget Bureau recommended not more than $50,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the amount which the Budget Bureau recommended. The Senate committee could have reduced it, but the Senate committee allowed exactly what the Budget Bureau recommended, in which the President concurred.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is aware of that fact. I am also aware of the fact that the Appropriations Committee could have——

Mr. WHERRY. It could have cut it down.

Mr. KERR. It could have reported a bill containing a larger amount.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. How could the Appropriation Committee of the Senate——

Mr. KERR. I have answered the question of the Senator from Nebraska, and I should like now to proceed with my discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will allow me to answer that one question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. The Senator has asked me a question. If he will permit me to answer it, I shall be glad to yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. The money already appropriated has taken care of approximately 70 schools in the Nation. The $50,000,000 which the Appropriations Committee has included in the pending bill would take care of between 95 and 100 more such schools. The additional $50,000,000 called for by the amendment which I and other Senators are sponsoring would take care of an additional 227 schools in approximately 36 States. I recognize the forcefulness of what was said by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD]——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think I have certain information which was not presented to the Budget Bureau, and which shows the additional need.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, after I have finished with respect to this particular item.

The request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that the amendment be changed from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 would be more than justified, Mr. President, because if Congress accepts the pending amendment, making the amount $100,000,000 instead of $50,000,000, there will still be nearly half of the school districts in the United States where the enrollment is substantially increased by the presence of the children of defense workers, whose requirements will not be met even by the adoption of the amendment calling for $100,000,000. So this amendment does not seek to go beyond reasonable objectives. It is in reality a halfway measure.

Were it not for my feeling that the Senate conferees would not be able to keep more than $100,000,000 in the bill, I would happily join with the Senator from Kentucky and ask that the amount be made $150,000,000. However, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has indicated a feeling that there might be a possibility of keeping in the bill most of the $100,000,000 if the Senate were to approve that amount. For that reason I have felt that the wise thing to do was to follow through on that basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I think I can give some new evidence.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I offer this in the form of new information, or information on a new subject, since the committee passed on this question.

Even after the $50,000,000 is applied under the formula now in effect, we shall still have schools which have from 50 to 60 percent of their student body coming from families directly connected with Federal activities, who will still not be able to come within the formula and receive any of this relief. That is particularly true with respect to certain recent developments.

Consider the case of Biloxi, Miss., where Keesler Field is located. A new expansion program has just been authorized and started, calling for the expenditure of $36,000,000, which will bring that Air Force base up to a population of 64,000. It is situated entirely within the city of Biloxi. The expansion program will make more than 40 percent of that area federally owned and controlled.

There are now 625 family units on the base, and 720 others are in the process of construction. It is estimated that there will be more than 500 new children coming into that district alone within the next year, because of the present construction. As I say, the area is more than 40 percent federally owned and controlled.

That is new evidence which applies particularly to the question of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. The situation which he has described in his State is not an isolated example, but an example of a general condition.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the senior Senator from Oklahoma in this amendment. As a former governor of my State I am somewhat familiar with the school problems in our defense areas. We have elementary schools in Wichita, Kans.,

which are operating both forenoon and afternoon shifts, and consideration is now being given to three shifts a day in some of Wichita's elementary schools.

Someone may say, "Why do not the local communities begin construction of the buildings needed for the increased enrollment?" The fact is that we have a legal tax-levy limit in our State for issuance of bonds for school construction. The city of Wichita has levied the maximum limit for construction of school buildings and school purposes generally. Not only that, but many communities have gone to the tax commission and have received authority to exceed the legal limit by 25 percent. This is the maximum that can be secured without further legislative enactment.

The situation is serious not only in Wichita, but in several other defense areas. I mention only Kansas. I am sure that the same situation prevails in other States. I believe that the Congress owes a duty to the communities where defense production has been expanded beyond the reasonable degree of expansion which might have been anticipated in the normal growth of a city or community. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the Senate will seriously study this amendment. Even if the amendment is adopted, we shall be doing our duty only partially; but, at least, it is a step in the right direction.

The situation is serious, and I sincerely hope that some consideration will be given to the communities, which are doing everything within their legal limits. If they were not doing their full duty I would not be pleading for this money; but they are, and they must have Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement from the Federal Security Agency giving a list of the school districts in Kansas which prior to March 12, 1951, submitted applications under Public Law 815 for assistance in constructing school facilities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DIVISION OF STATE AND LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

KANSAS

List of school districts which prior to March 12, 1951, submitted applications under Public Law 815 for assistance in constructing school facilities

School districts for which funds are being reserved on a priority basis, pending final action upon the application: Application No. 5[1] common school district No. 178, Planeview-Wichita, Sedgwick County, Federal funds reserved, $172,734.

School districts which have submitted applications for assistance and for which no funds can be reserved at this time:

1. Board of Education of the city of Junction City.
2. Common school district No. 127 (Mulvane).
3. Common school district (Derby).
4. Common school district No. 120 (Wichita).
6. Wichita school district No. 1.
7. Common school district No. 122 (Andover).
8. Common school district No. 27 (Wichita).
9. Board of Education of the city of Leavenworth.
10. Roseland school district No. 92 (Kansas City).
11. School district No. 124 (Wichita).
12. De Soto rural high school district No. 3.
13. Common school district No. 31 (De Soto).
14. Common school district joint 33 (Clearwater).

[1] Includes projects on which final approval has been given.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I appreciate his calling attention again to the fact that this is not a program in which the Federal Government pays the full cost of the additional buildings. It pays only a percentage of it. It is a program in which the local districts themselves are carrying their full proportionate part of the cost, both with reference to the construction of the buildings and the supplying of the equipment and the payment of operating costs of the institutions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not discuss the merits of the question, because I was one of those who helped to pass the original act. Does the Senator know how much money has already been appropriated for grants under the original act?

Mr. KERR. Under the act to which this appropriation is related, the original appropriation was $46,500,000. Of that appropriation $15,000,000 was reserved for the construction of school facilities on military reservations, and the remaining $31,500,000 was sufficient to provide a part of the cost of buildings in only 72 of the 800, 900, or 1,000 districts in the Nation where the need exists, and for which authorization was made by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator about the allocation of the original appropriation, which now totals $49,500,000. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, however, regardless of the breakdown, how much has been obligated as of March 31, 1951. That was the testimony which was presented by the Budget Bureau. How much of the $49,500,000 has actually been obligated?

Mr. KERR. I cannot answer that question. I have very reliable information respecting this matter, and if the Senator really wants that information I will get it for him.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to get it and put it in the RECORD. But when I have done so, when it is done, it will not change the fact that as of this moment only 70 schools have a sufficiently high priority rating for their needs even to be considered for the moneys made available by the previous appropriation, which I am informed was $46,000,000, but, as the Senator from Nebraska says, is $49,500,000—and that can be correct. The other 700, or nearly 1,000 schools, Mr. President, are not even eligible under the priority formula established by the Office of Education to have their applications considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no question about the merits of the case. But the question is how much money should be appropriated in this supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. KERR. In answer to that question——

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish.

Mr. KERR. Let me answer the Senator's question, and then I will let him finish. I do not believe the United States Government should discriminate between the youth of the Nation, all of whom have been found under the law to be equally entitled to have an opportunity for an education. The Senator says the law was justified. He says the need should be met. When the need of 70 out of a larger group, all of whom are equally eligible, is met, it dramatizes the fact. Mr. President, that the other 800 or 900 school districts are being discriminated against. But then when, as is proposed to be done by appropriation of $50,000,000 reported by the committee, provision is made for an additional 92 school districts, the fact is redramatized that the 700 or 800 others not covered are discriminated against.

I thank the Senator for saying that the program should have been enacted when it was enacted, that it is equitable, and that money should be provided for it, and I wish he would join with me and other Senators who would like to see the Government itself made responsible to all these youths who are before it with equal eligibility and equal claim under the law.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator now yield for a question, please?

Mr. KERR. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator answer the question.

Mr. KERR. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not ask the Senator to make a speech. Anybody can make a speech, during which he wraps the flag around the school system. I have done it myself. But will the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that all the applications made to the Office of Education up to March 31 total only $1,306,000?

The second question——

Mr. KERR. Let me answer them one at a time.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the Senator two questions, and he can make two answers.

Mr. KERR. No; I have a one-track mind and a narrow-gage roadbed, and I will answer them one at a time. I told the Senator from Nebraska a while ago that I did not know how many had been approved.

Mr. WHERRY. That is an answer to the question.

Mr. KERR. I told the Senator further——

Mr. WHERRY. That answers the question.

Mr. KERR. I am going to make a remark about it. Furthermore, regard-

less of how many of them had not been accepted and approved, only 72 of them could be accepted and approved within the original appropriation, because when that was done the original appropriation would be exhausted.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield now for the other question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what amount has actually been expended of the $49,500,000, as shown by the testimony presented within the last few days, ending March 31, 1951? How much money has actually been spent?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I will again answer that question by telling my good friend that I do not know. If he derives any joy out of having me repeatedly acknowledge my ignorance with reference to a detail of this program, I will stand here and acknowledge it over and over and over again.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has answered the question. Will he yield further?

Mr. KERR. But we still get back to the same proposition, that when about——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. One moment—that when about 7 or 8 percent of those for whom the authorization was made are taken care of, there will be no money left of the original appropriation to take care of the other 90 or 95 percent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. I will tell the Senator I am going to take this slower. I will yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and let the Senator from Nebraska rest a little, and then I will come back to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, is it not true that in a good many school districts, although the Federal Security Agency has granted them entitlement under Public Law 815 for the construction of school facilities, those school districts are not receiving the entitlement which has been granted, and they have been notified to that effect?

Mr. KERR. I understand that is absolutely correct, and they have been so notified because the original appropriation does not contain sufficient money to enable the Office of Education to proceed as it would like to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have in my hand a telegram from the superintendent of schools at the location of Fort Knox, in which he says that approximately 25 percent of the pupils in the Elizabethtown schools have parents working at Fort Knox. The Federal Security Agency has granted them an entitlement of $195,762, but notified them that because of insufficient funds it will not pay the application.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for calling attention to the telegram. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram is as follows:

ELIZABETHTOWN, KY., *May 8, 1951.*

Hon. TOM UNDERWOOD,
United States Senate:

Federal Security Agency has granted entitlement of $195,762 under Public Law 815 for construction school facilities, Elizabethtown city schools. However, because of insufficient funds, Security Agency will not pay this obligation. Approximately 25 percent of Elizabethtown school pupils have parents working at Fort Knox, and this overloads our schools. It is our hope you can support deficiency appropriation sufficient to guarantee payment of our entitlement. Kindest regards.

H. C. TAYLOR,
Superintendent,
Elizabethtown City Schools.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator on the merits of the case, but inasmuch as $49,500,000 has been appropriated, and only $220,000 spent, and inasmuch as this is an emergency appropriation granting $50,000,000 more, which is all that the Bureau of the Budget asks, which gives the agency $99,500,000, none of which, outside of the $220,000 has been spent, I ask if the proper procedure would not be for the Senator or anyone else desiring larger appropriations to come before the committees of both the House and the Senate and ask for additional authorization?

I might say to the distinguished Senator that already the agency is going to ask for $50,000,000 more money in connection with the regular appropriation bill. What I am trying to get over to the Senator from Oklahoma is that even though we all agree respecting the merits of this matter, there should be orderly procedure. Apparently, the money that has already been allocated to the Office of Education cannot possibly be spent. We are now considering a supplemental appropriation bill which only came before us within the last few days. The regular appropriation bill will be before us shortly, and if the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma then wants to increase the authorization on the basis of the merits of the case, I ask him if he does not believe that to be the proper place to make his case and secure the proper increase for which he is asking.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have never seen him more generously and generally in accord with the merits of a proposal or any more tenacious in his efforts to prevent anything being done about it.

Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, wherein he asks for orderly procedure. Just a few days ago he called me to order on the Senate floor because he imagined or thought that I was out of order, and after he and I discussed the matter privately but completely, it was very apparent to my good friend that I had not been out of order. I and other Senators are following a certain procedure in an effort to meet a situation which the Senator from Nebraska is effusively complimentary of by saying he admits that it has merit. If the procedure we seek to invoke lacks in not being so orderly as my good friend would like to have it, I hope the lack can be made up for by the fact that the merits of the amendment are so great.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KERR. I should like to make a further observation first.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska asked me if I did not know that this agency will return with a request for another $50,000,000 in connection with the regular appropriation bill. Of course, I know that. The authorization was made either a year or two years ago, and the thousands of school districts over the Nation, with the tens of thousands of school children, are hampered; they are afflicted with creeping paralysis until this program is adequately implemented.

Mr. President, I am reminded of a story.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he tells the story?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I simply must tell this story; I cannot fail to take advantage of this opportunity. I am reminded of a good Irish lady who went to Pat, her husband, on a Saturday morning, and said to him, "Sure, Pat, would you give me a dollar?"

He said, "Oh, go along with you, Bridget. You have asked me for a dollar every day this week."

"Sure, and I have, Pat," she said, "but up to now you ain't given it to me."

Certainly this agency is going to come back and ask for $50,000,000—the same $50,000,000 that should have been given to it after the authorization was made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am going to ask a question, if I can get the Senator's answer without having him make a speech.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator that I shall answer the question for his benefit and I shall make the speech for my own benefit.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought possibly the Senator would make the speech for the benefit of the voters throughout the country.

Mr. KERR. I must say that if I did, it would not establish a precedent in this great institution.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not raising any question about precedent. I think the Senator knows the answers to almost everything.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator; I think he does, too.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator answer this question: The President recommended $50,000,000——

Mr. KERR. Is that a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Fifty million dollars——

Mr. KERR. Is that a question, too?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not through asking the question. I want the Senator to get this through his head——

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska, in that regard, that even one who seeks to teach something to a dog has to know more than the dog knows.

Mr. WHERRY. That is why I am waiting to see whether the Senator understands what I am attempting to ask him.

Mr. KERR. Suppose the Senator from Nebraska carries the experiment one step further by asking the question and then he will see whether I can understand it.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the question first, and then the Senator can make any answer he wishes to make.

Mr. KERR. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. No. 1, the President recommended $50,000,000. No. 2, the Bureau of the Budget recommended $50,000,000. No. 3, the Appropriations Committee has recommended $50,000,000.

In the beginning, I asked whether aside from the recommendation of the Budget Bureau, there is any evidence, for this emergency appropriation, which would indicate that the Senate should increase the amount beyond $50,000,000. I have heard all the arguments the Senator has made about increasing the appropriation; but the facts are that the Office of Education has spent only $227,000 out of $49,500,000, and the $50,000,000 in question is to be appropriated for the need between now and June 30 of this year.

Inasmuch as the House of Representatives has not had any evidence at all about this matter which it could consider, it is recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee that $50,000,000 be appropriated for the emergency. In the interest of orderly procedure, and in the absence of any new evidence, does not the Senator feel that any further justification should be handled in the way that such agencies are expected to handle it? Already this agency is requesting $50,000,000 for next year. If that request is handled in that way, then if this requested appropriation is made, we would have total appropriations of approximately $150,000,000, and all of that would be justified. Up to this moment I am suggesting exactly what the President of the United States has recommended.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to dispatch a riding page to the White House to tell the President of the United States that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has wrapped the mantle of the President's recommendation around his shoulders and now is making a fight to implement it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right; and, Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please; I am not yielding to him now. He has asked me five different questions. I would not wish to say anything unkind; but, after all, if I have given to the Senator from Nebraska some evidence and some things which I have a little difficulty getting through my head, I must say that the Senator from Nebraska has given me some cause to believe that he has difficulty getting some things through his head, because I have answered several times the question in regard to new evidence and the situation as to how much money has actually been spent. I say again to the Senator that the situation is disclosed by the telegram which has been given to me by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. His constituent advises him in the same way that my constituents have been advising me, as follows:

> Security Agency has granted entitlements of considerable sums of money for construction purposes under Public Law 815. However, because of insufficient funds, Security Agency cannot implement these entitlements or pay this money out.

Mr. President, I do not believe the United States Senate is going to shackle its feet with a formula of orderly procedure, as referred to by the Senator from Nebraska, and thereby chain itself and tie its hands and prevent itself from meeting this need for the school children of the Nation, this need which was recognized by the Congress many months ago in the authorization, and is recognized by the Congress in part by means of a previous appropriation, as well as by means of the appropriation provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he went before the Appropriations Committee to present this need.

Mr. KERR. The answer to that question is "Yes." We went to the Bureau of the Budget; we went to the Appropriations Committee; and we went nearly everywhere else. I must say that, after as orderly procedure as I know how to follow, having failed to secure what we need and what we are entitled to under Public Law 815, we now, in just as orderly procedure, come to the Senate and ask the Senate to provide the funds.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the Senator another question, which is this: Is not what has happened in this case something like the case of a man who, in writing his will, disposes of about two or three times as much property as he has? Have not the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education notified school districts all over the Nation that they have entitlements which amount to two or three times as much as what those agencies have spent? Although those agencies have not spent all the funds they have, they have notified county school superintendents that they have entitlements which are far beyond what has been granted.

Mr. KERR. That is correct. The Office of Education itself asked the Bureau of the Budget to recommend the appropriation of $100,000,000.

I wish to say this about the example my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, has used: He asked me whether this situation is somewhat like that of a man who makes a will by which he makes bequests amounting to three or four times as much as he has in his estate. Let me say that this situation not only is like that case, but in order to make the illustration entirely analogous, he who made the will and aroused the hopes of his heirs thereby, not only would have to make provision to give away three or four times as much as he had, but then he would have to refuse to die, so that none of the heirs would get anything.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that on page 563 of the hearings on the third supplemental appropriation bill there is found the request which was made for this item.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that information.

Mr. President, I believe that on the basis of equity, on the basis of the Government's meeting a responsibility which exists and which it has acknowledged and written into law, on the basis of taking care of a program which is a vital, indispensable part of the defense effort, and in order that the Government may not be guilty of discriminating against one group within a large classification of school children who are as much entitled to have their needs met as those whose needs are already being met, the Senate should accept the amendment which I and other Senators have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have such startling facts before me with reference to recent developments within school districts in my State, which I feel sure are typical of those in areas elsewhere, that I am going to take a few moments to call them to the attention of the Senate. After the $50,000,000 which is included in the committee amendment is applied, under the present formula, there will still be school districts, from 50 to 60 percent of whose student bodies come from Federal activities, which will not come within the province of the $50,000,000 formula which is to be applied.

I mentioned a while ago, in my question, the situation at Biloxi, Miss., where there will soon be Air Force personnel of 64,000 located entirely within the corporate limits of that small city. What is proposed to be done about the children of the Air Force personnel? Let me state what the local people have done. Of the money received in local taxes which they

are permitted to spend under the law, they have spent every dime. They have taken in as many of those children as they possibly can. Their school buildings are overcrowded. The situation affects not only the city of Biloxi itself but the surrounding towns. There is not adequate space. Between now and the next school session there will be an expansion program, with the addition of 720 family units on the base, which units are in process of construction, and which will result in more children to provide for. As I have said, the local authorities in that little city and the surrounding towns and cities have done all they can do with their limited facilities. What are we to do about those children?

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask the Senator from Nebraska, What does he propose that we do for these extra children?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator gone before the Bureau of the Budget to present his case?

Mr. STENNIS. I have not. These additional facts have developed recently, in part, because of the great expansion of Keesler Field at Biloxi and also the shipbuilding activities at Pascagoula, which is the next town along the coast. In the other direction there has also been an expansion of Government facilities, which has mushroomed this problem within the past few weeks and months.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator appear before the Appropriations Committee to present those facts?

Mr. STENNIS. I talked to individual members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and it may be that I filed a statement regarding it. I did not appear before the committee in person.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has asked me what to do about it.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. There are similar situations within my own State, but I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he does not feel that, inasmuch as the Bureau of the Budget, in this emergency bill, has recommended $50,000,000 with which to carry the Department over until June 30, its recommendation is reasonable? It has recommended $50,000,000. I am not sure that this would take care of Mississippi; it may. The Budget Bureau asks for contract authority, or for money with which to operate until June 30, in the sum of $50,000,000. That is the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, which means that it is the recommendation of the President of the United States.

I shall answer the Senator in this way: If Mississippi is not within that group, certainly if I were the Senator I should go to the Appropriations Committee, because the general bill is now being considered in both the House and Senate committees. I have already indicated that the Budget is asking for $50,000,000 additional. I would certainly see that the towns in Mississippi were included and were taken care of.

If I were the Senator and felt that the amount asked was not sufficient, I would ask for more. If the Senator were a member of the committee, and if the Bureau of the Budget came forward and said, "All we need is $50,000,000 to enable us to operate until June 30," would not the Senator support that request? Would he not feel that the administration, which is charged with responsibility, had given the matter sufficient study, and that if the emergency bill carried $50,000,000, then a justification should be presented for any further authorization desired, the appropriations to be made as needed?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not think the Bureau of the Budget has said that $50,000,000 is all that is needed in order to meet the present emergency condition. If it did say so, it is grossly in error in its facts; does not know the subject with which it is trying to deal, and does not know the facts with which we are presently confronted in the congested areas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe I said what the Senator has suggested. If I did, I did not mean to say it. I said the Budget Bureau had recommended that $50,000,000 be appropriated to take care of the needs until the end of the fiscal year. I am not speaking for the Budget Bureau, but I do not for one moment mean to say that they have not recognized, and will not recognize that additional money will be required for additional facilities. All I am saying is that they recommended $50,000,000 for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. STENNIS. It is not a matter of trying to blame someone, or to blame the Budget Bureau. It is a matter of providing the means with which to take care of the children. Everyone knows that school buildings cannot simply be thrown together by a special process of construction, and completed overnight, after the new fiscal year begins, and still be ready for school in September. This is a practical matter. If the need for the money exists, the thing to do is to place the authorization in the first appropriation bill which comes along, and, if the need does not exist, then it is not entitled to further consideration.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi, first, whether it does not seem to him to be reasonable that one who has disagreed with the President and his Budget Bureau so often as has the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, should not be too upset to find that the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Oklahoma disagree with it once?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi one more question.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the answer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi one more question. Does he think that the fact that the additional money sought by this amendment, if provided by the Congress on the basis of the formula established by the Department of Education, would be spent in from 36 to 40 States, but that Nebraska does not happen to be one of them——

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know?

Mr. KERR. Would account for the fact that the Senator from Nebraska is so anxious to follow the President and the Budget Director at this time, instead of supporting and meeting of the need which is so apparent and so acute in so many places within the United States?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we come back to the question of what we are to do about taking care of the children beginning with the school year in September of this year. It matters not which budget contains the provision, nor in which bill the figures are actually inserted. The question is, Is the need present, and shall we meet it?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, who has done his level best to justify all appropriations of public money——

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And as one who is going along with the Budget Bureau in its recommendation of $50,000,000 for this purpose, granting to be true everything which has been said by the Senator, for whose honor and integrity I have a high regard, as he well knows, how can we justify more than the amount recommended by the committee? The Senator from Oklahoma merely takes out of the air $50,000,000 more. Here comes another request, "Give them another $50,000,000"; and then another $50,000,000. It is just like an auction.

I ask the Senator whether it is not necessary to justify the appropriation. I submit to the fairness and the integrity of the distinguished Senator that we are guided by the recommendations of the Budget Bureau as to the justification of such claims as are made. The pending bill is only an emergency measure, which will apply until June 30. Within that time limit we have granted the full amount recommended by the Budget Bureau to the Congress. That has nothing to do with the merits of the case or with the additional appropriations which might be needed, not only in Mississippi, but in many other places in the United States, when the proper time arrives.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the fairness of the Senator. When the formula was applied to the $50,000,000 figure which the committee put into the bill, many persons, including myself, realized the inadequacy of the $50,000,000, and felt that it would

not meet the conditions which I have been describing, and conditions in the towns surrounding Biloxi are just as severe and acute, even more so. We have realized the seriousness of the situation, and appreciate that $50,000,000 will not bring about a solution to the problem.

Mr. WHERRY. There is not anything in the RECORD, so far as I know, which indicates how the money is to be distributed by States. The first I learned of it was contained in the very political statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma, that 36 States are going to receive so much money. Nebraska was not included.

The formula was prepared by the Office of Education, was it not?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Budget Bureau recommended $50,000,000. Maybe the Bureau was wrong in its recommendation.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not complaining of the formula. There is simply a question of there not being sufficient money to meet the conditions which I have been trying to describe.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it the position of the Senator from Mississippi that if the increase of $50,000,000 which is the subject matter of the pending amendment is granted, it will go into the construction of schools? Does the Senator know whether it will go for construction purposes, or for preliminary surveys? Obviously, if it is for surveys it will not be of much help in point of time. Additional military installations have recently been located in my State and they are placing further burdens upon some of the municipalities. As a result, additional educational facilities are needed. The ability to levy additional taxes to provide the necessary funds has been extremely curtailed, and as a result, if the additional amount requested in the amendment is to be utilized within defense areas, after proper scrutiny I think it is a matter with which we must deal realistically. I am sure that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kansas is entirely correct. I am informed by the clerk of the committee that the money will go for construction if the appropriation be made. It does not involve surveys or anything else that will extend the time or commit the Federal Government to further appropriations.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am very glad to know that, because I feel that there is a legal responsibility upon local areas to make the proper surveys.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree with the Senator on that point. The local conditions with which I am familiar have been met in that respect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have a list of the States and cities involved?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has such a list.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if it will be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say that this is not a State problem. It is a question of what is going to be done with reference to the education of the additional children in cases where the local facilities and capacity have already been fully exhausted. No school district will receive any money under the formula until the facts show that the local authorities have met all the conditions and that a real emergency exists.

I have mentioned Biloxi, but the problem is equally as great at Pascagoula, and at Moss Point, a few miles from Biloxi, where other Federal activities on the Mississippi Gulf coast are centered. As an indication of what can be expected from the shipyards, which now employ 1,200 workers, most of whom have families, there will be 2,000 employed by September and 3,500 by next January. The shipyard which I have in mind might be called a war shipyard, at which a great number of ships were built during World War II. It afterwards became largely inactive until the occurrence of this new emergency. It will employ 3,500 workers by next January, as compared with 1,200 workers at this time.

What is to be done about the children, in view of the fact that the local facilities are already used to full capacity? The families will overflow into Pascagoula and Moss Point, only a few miles away. Both towns house many of the families from the Air Force base. On the other side of Biloxi is the city of Gulfport, at which hundreds of Air Force personnel reside. Many Air Force families reside in the town of Ocean Springs. Under the $50,000,000 deficiency appropriation, I am advised that not a single one of the schools in this area will receive 10 cents in benefits. That is why I am urging the matter over and over again. In the face of the facts I have outlined, according to the present formula, under the $50,000,000 figure, not one single town or school district will be permitted to have one dime, in spite of the fact that the number of workers will be increased from 1,200 to 3,500 by next January.

I shall not take up any further time of the Senate, Mr. President, but I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. STENNIS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

We are concerned in this appropriation with one of the incidental but direct and very vital costs of the defense effort. When Public Law 815 was devised last year to provide a measure of relief to school facilities in areas which were overloaded with students brought in by Federal activities, there was no suggestion that the present difficulties stemming from the Korean situation would have to be faced. Not even last September, when the law was finally enacted, was there any idea that such an accelerated program of mobilization would be engaged in as we have witnessed in the last few months.

So great has been the need, which the defense effort has occasioned since that time, that the initial appropriation for aid in school construction under the terms of that act for this fiscal year—the sum of $46,500,000, of which $15,000,000 was earmarked for school facilities on military reservations—was adequate to touch only the most critical areas. This money was sufficient to assist only 70 schools and did not begin to relieve the hardships of some of the areas originally contemplated to be aided when Public Law 815 was originally designed. It is my understanding that the $50,000,000 which has been reported by the committee will enable another 97 schools to qualify for assistance. I am advised that under the priority system established by the Office of Education this will enable schools with an index of 75 and above to qualify. This means that some schools with as much as 50 or 60 percent of their student body coming from families directly connected with Federal activities will still not be able to come in for a share of relief. These conditions will, of course, become even more critical as the defense program gets up a full head of steam. As a matter of fact, we shall not have the main blow hit us until the schools open again next fall. It is this situation which makes the issue such an urgent one. Unless we take action now to begin to provide for the next term, when the hardest blow will fall, it will be entirely too late to do anything about it.

I can speak with authority only for the affected areas of my own State in connection with this appropriation, but within those areas the problem has been compounded to such an extent that it is absolutely beyond the capacities of the localities to meet the demands of the situation. Within a very small geographical area both one of the largest Air Force bases and one of the largest shipyards in the country are now moving into rapid expansion. At Biloxi a $36,000,000 expansion program at Keesler Air Force Base will mean that within the next few months some 64,000 Air Force personnel will be stationed there. This base is entirely within the corporate limits of the city of Biloxi and is located entirely within one school district. It and other Federally owned property comprise 40 percent of the total area of Biloxi. There are now some 629 family units on the base, and 720 others are in the process of construction. It is estimated that there will be 500 more children of school age in Biloxi next year than there were this year. Already an old frame building built in 1898 and proviously abandoned has been put back into use as a school building, even though it is unsafe and is a firetrap of the most dangerous kind. Yet under the appropriations made available so far and presently contemplated, Biloxi will not receive a red cent under the present index of need.

This may be accounted for to some extent by the fact that Biloxi has attempted to meet its own problems out of its own resources. Since the coming of Keesler Field in World War II, the city has spent almost a half-million dollars to expand the school facilities. The millage for the support of schools has been doubled, and is now at the maximum allowed by law. The problem is just too big for the local community to meet with its own resources.

The problem is duplicated at Pascagoula and Moss Point, a few miles from Biloxi, where much of the industrial activity on the Mississippi Gulf Coast is centered. As an indication of what can be expected there, the shipyards, which now employ 1,200 workers, most of whom have families, will have 2,000 employed by September and 3,500 by next

January. Their families overflow from the limited housing facilities in Pascagoula into Moss Point, only 3 miles away. Both towns also house many of the families from Keesler Air Force Base. On the other side of Biloxi is the city of Gulfport, where hundreds of other Air Force personnel live. Also close by is the town of Ocean Springs, where many Air Force families reside. Yet under the $50,000,000 deficiency appropriation, I am advised that not a single one of the above schools will receive any benefit.

This is not a question of taking $50,000,000 and reducing the proportion by which these schools will benefit. It is simply a matter of getting a larger appropriation or nothing. Under the present index the schools in the area which I have described will receive absolutely no help from the $50,000,000 appropriation. I shall not quarrel here with the system which has been devised to determine which schools will share in the funds, but you cannot tell me that a serious condition does not exist down there on the Mississippi Gulf coast, where hundreds of boys and girls just will not and cannot be housed unless some assistance is forthcoming at this time. The answer does not lie in the appropriation for next year either, for the need exists now to meet the emergency which will become so acute by next fall. There is the further consideration that applications which have not yet been considered must be taken into account in determining where next year's funds will go.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my feeling with respect to the responsibility which I conceive the Federal Government to have concerning the housing of the children in these affected areas, and I am a very staunch and firm believer in the idea that local units of government should make every effort to meet their own problems before turning to the National Government. But the situation which we see on the Mississippi coast and which exists in so many other areas of the country is one created entirely by the Federal Government and one which will exist only at the sufferance of the Federal Government. The only way in which the local communities can solve the problem is to issue bonds, and I might say here that virtually every school system affected in Mississippi, has already done that very thing, but those people, as much as they want to do their part, cannot continue indefinitely to issue bonds to be paid off in 20 years or more, when the need for which the bonds were issued may evaporate in a period of 2 or 3 years. Those communities are already heavily saddled with an indebtedness incurred for the construction of school facilities, and it is just too much to ask them to construct more. They are making a sacrifice in another respect, too, for they who have been paying taxes and paying off bonds for years to build up a creditable school system for their children now find their facilities being crowded to such an extent that their children are not getting the benefit of adequate instruction. Such intolerably crowded conditions are not fair to any who have to patronize such schools.

If there has ever been an appropriation before the Congress that represented a sound investment not just in the immediate defense effort but in the improvement of educational facilities for many years to come, then this is it. By increasing this appropriation to $100,000,000 we shall provide relief for some of the most critical defense areas in the country—areas which are badly crippled and which can receive absolutely no relief under the original deficiency appropriation. This amendment will afford assistance to 227 different schools in 37 States. The need is real and urgent. I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator also include the table to which reference has been made?

Mr. STENNIS. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky if the table was prepared by the Office of Education?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is in the hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no record here, and I am a member of the committee, and I wondered if the towns were included in the record of the hearings. I should like very much to have the Senator insert the list in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I make that request.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

List of schools showing total applications by States submitted to U. S. Office of Education under provisions of Public Law 815 and the number of schools with a priority of 40 to 75

State	Applications	
	Total number	Number with priority 40 to 75
Alabama	17	4
Arizona	28	9
Arkansas	18	9
California	58	24
Colorado	12	3
Connecticut	10	1
Florida	8	2
Georgia	24	11
Idaho	7	3
Illinois	22	8
Indiana	4	0
Iowa	9	2
Kansas	14	2
Kentucky	10	2
Louisiana	13	2
Maine	11	5
Maryland	8	4
Michigan	34	15
Massachusetts	3	0
Minnesota	12	0
Mississippi	8	4
Missouri	21	8
Montana	16	4
Nebraska	11	0
Nevada	5	0
New Hampshire	4	0
New Jersey	6	1
New Mexico	12	3
New York	8	4
North Carolina	8	0
North Dakota	6	2
Ohio	25	10
Oklahoma	22	7
Oregon	21	4
Pennsylvania	9	3
Rhode Island	3	2
South Dakota	3	0
South Carolina	5	1
Tennessee	17	5
Texas	72	24
Utah	6	2
Vermont	1	0
Virginia	17	3
Washington	64	26
Wisconsin	2	0
Wyoming	2	1

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. The request before the committee called for $50,000,000. The committee felt that the necessities were in favor of the application for the funds, and it allowed them in the sum of $50,000,000.

Again, Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that this matter was before the Deficiency Appropriations Committee. In this instance it was the full committee, although but a few members were able to attend because of other business of the Senate. This particular request came first to the Senate. It has not been considered by the House. It has not even been thoroughly considered by the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee which handled the regular appropriation bill. Due to the press of time and due to the fact that the matter came before our committee in the first instance, prior to consideration of it by the House, I very frankly say that the full consideration which would have been ordinarily given to it as a regular appropriation item could not be given to it. Even so, the committee did make a reasonably close examination into the justification. It was satisfied that there was a sound basis for the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, the action of the Bureau of the Budget is not sacrosanct. The Bureau is a recommending agency. It speaks for the President of the United States. It has been my experience during several years on the Committee on Appropriations that the Bureau of the Budget is never particularly niggardly in its requests for public funds. Generally, during the years that I have been acquainted with appropriations, Congress has found it necessary to reduce the figures, sometimes most drastically, which were presented by the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently, if we are to consider the matter on the basis of the practice indulged in by the Bureau of the Budget we could be pardoned without doing serious injury to logic, if we thought that the recommended figure could be accepted as a maximum. However, that matter was not before the committee. We went into the question on its merits.

We are dealing with a new act, which implements an established practice of the Government. Under the old Lanham Act and under the war powers granted during the war the Government aided school districts in areas where there had been a heavy influx of defense workers, with a resultant heavy increase in school enrollment beyond the ability of the districts to financially meet the new burden. The act was the first formal action by Congress in support of that principle. That the principle is sound I believe no one will question. It is founded not only in sound reason, but in necessity. Its application by the agency began this year. Heretofore it was handled by the Bureau of Community Facilities in the Federal Works Agency.

Under the terms of the law certain findings must be made by the Federal Security Agency before it is warranted in expending any funds. Such findings have been in progress since the bill was passed and implemented with the original $3,000,000 for survey purposes. However, the findings are not complete. It will be years before there are adequate data on the whole subject as it relates to the United States. The Agency has adopted an arbitrary scale

of priorities—arbitrary in the figures used, but exactly in accord with the requirements of the law. It has under the law and under its own rules applied such funds as are available to the schools of highest priority. The priority is in exact ratio to the percentage of children in the schools whose parents work for the Federal Government or live on federally owned nontaxed lands.

Of necessity it has taken some time to gather the information. The information is based upon certain knowledge of the Federal lands involved or Federal installations involved. It has been based upon certain knowledge as to the number of children who will be added to the several school facilities in the areas.

The Agency very frankly says that most of its present data are preliminary. The exact wording reads:

One further point should be emphasized. The priority indexes on which the classification discussed—

That is the classification which has been presented to the Senate—

above were based were set after preliminary review of a majority of the applications.

I will reread the sentence:

The priority indexes on which the classification discussed above were based were set after preliminary review of a majority of the applications.

I read further:

The priority position of any project may change as a result of a detailed review of the submission of additional data by the school districts. Thus it should be clear that the above-stated priority data are tentative and that the estimates indicating need tend to understate rather than overstate the actual needs.

Mr. President, I am in entire accord with the last sentence. The data involved probably are an understatement of the needs under the law. However, the point I wish to make is that there is not now available to the Security Agency the necessary information on which to allocate funds now on hand.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator read a statement. May I inquire what the date of the statement was?

Mr. CORDON. The statement from which I was reading was the one which was presented to the committee 2 weeks ago.

Mr. STENNIS. As of what date did it speak?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot say. It was presented to the committee as representing the current situation.

Mr. WHERRY. April 18.

Mr. STENNIS. It does not expressly state that it is speaking as of the date it was presented, does it?

Mr. CORDON. It does not.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am not trying to be technical. If the Senator will yield for an observation, I should like to say that surveys have been made and applications have been filed, as to which proof is available, which would readily absorb the $100,000,000 requested in the present formula, without changing it one iota.

Mr. CORDON. The statement of the Senator again emphasizes the vice of trying to legislate on the floor of the Senate. I have no doubt that the Senator has received the information which he has presented to me, because when he says he has received it, it imparts absolute verity to me. However if we are to have orderly procedure in the Senate and if we are to have some kind of logical consideration of problems which come before the Senate, we shall have to follow the policy and program of the Senate of submitting such matters to the committees which are set up to consider them.

In this instance I have read the statement of the agency. The statement was presented to the committee, and the committee acted on it. No other statement has been presented to the committee. That the agency is proceeding with the work, I do not doubt. It should be. Unquestionably it has moved farther ahead than it had when the matter was before the committee. I hope it has. I am sure it has. But, Mr. President, there is now before the Senate a request of the agency for $50,000,000, which has been allowed. There is another bill pending in the House, which contains another recommendation of $50,000,000.

That other bill has yet to be considered by the committee. I know that it is impossible that there could be a commitment by the agency of $46,000,000 plus $50,000,000 or $96,000,000 before the next bill is before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which will take the time for an orderly examination into the whole question. The question here is, Shall we legislate on the basis of impulse and emotion, or shall we legislate after careful consideration?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I hasten to say that I appreciate the fine work of the Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Appropriations. I have had the honor of serving with him on one of the subcommittees, and I know of his very fine and conscientious work. I feel that he is entirely in sympathy with the acute problem which is presented here.

With reference to meeting the need, I ask the Senator if it is not true that the money will have to be provided either through a bill such as this, a supplemental appropriation bill, or in the regular general appropriation bill for the fiscal year. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. CORDON. Either one of those, or a supplemental bill thereafter. It would have to be provided by appropriation. There are at least two other bills which will come before us.

Mr. STENNIS. As a practical matter, last year the appropriation bill did not become law until the last day of December, or perhaps the early days of this year.

Mr. CORDON. No; that is not correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Were we not in session until January 1 of this year on the general appropriation bill?

Mr. CORDON. As I recall, the appropriation bill was finished in September. I am not certain as to the time. Whatever the time was, the bill was held up interminably, and represents an exception in that field.

Mr. STENNIS. At any rate, the point is that the general appropriation bill will not become law at least until the school session of 1951–52 is already in progress.

Mr. CORDON. I cannot agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I have yielded to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks about the information which I have received. I think I can vouch on the floor of the Senate for the fact that the need which has developed in the past few weeks is so urgent that there is no doubt that the application of even the strict formula would absorb the entire $50,000,000, which would be far from meeting the actual needs. Time is of the essence.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, first I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for his generous remarks. I have worked with him, and I feel for him what he has said he feels for me, both with respect to his honor and his judgment.

However, Mr. President, I wish to reach the point which he has mentioned in this way: The item of $50,000,000 which will be available under this bill if the committee report is accepted and adopted will still have to go through the House committee after we act, because it is a new item. In the meantime we shall be considering the bill which comes over from the House. The money in the third deficiency bill will unquestionably be made available about the first of June. That is about as soon as we can hope for. Then there will be a period of 30 days, in which allocations will be made. While I have not been able to put my finger on the item in the hearings, I specifically recall the testimony that of the 600 or 700 applications, only a handful has had the examination necessary, including consideration of plans and specifications, which is necessary in the construction field in order to entitle the applicants to a grant.

I appreciate the feeling of the Senator from Mississippi. During World War II we had a similar situation in my own State, and we had to scratch to try to find some means by which to educate these children. I want that done. But I am trying to say that adding this money without careful consideration will not advance the program one iota. It will go forward as rapidly after careful and thorough consideration and full report as it would if we were to act here on impulse and emotion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not the purpose of the Appropriations Committee to complete action on the appropriation bills during the month of July, if it can pos-

sibly be done? Is not that always the aim?

Mr. CORDON. There is no reason that I can see now why they should not be finished to a great extent by the end of June, and all of them by the end of July.

Mr. TAFT. The appropriations for the various agencies will be in separate bills and not in an omnibus bill, as was the case last year.

Mr. CORDON. They will be in a series of separate bills.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not also true, so far as the beginning of the school session is concerned, that this money is for construction, and that constructions of schools not even planned as yet certainly will not be completed during the year 1951, and possibly not during the year 1952?

Mr. CORDON. Of necessity it will take some time. It all depends, of course, upon the nature of the construction. That is a matter to be determined by the State and not by the Federal Government. The Federal Government will pass only upon sufficiency; the State upon the matter of the identity of the construction and the speed with which it is finished.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask a question on that very point. Does not this program contemplate construction which will be in the nature of annexes, additions to existing school buildings, renovation of abandoned school buildings, or construction of anything that can be put to practical use? Is not that a part of the plan? Therefore, 90-day renovation or construction would be entirely possible and probable in some cases.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator that all the types of acquisition, reconditioning, and construction which he has mentioned are contemplated in the act. The decision rests with the local authorities in every instance. The only requisite with reference to the Federal Government is approval of the character and type of the construction, to determine that it is adequate for the purpose.

Mr. President, I shall not burden the Senate for long. I wish to discuss one other matter——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It is my understanding that the construction will be undertaken, under the $50,000,000 appropriation recommended by the committee, on a priority basis. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. So that those communities which have the highest priority and the greatest need will be served by the $50,000,000 proposed by the committee.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. Is it not also true that the funds which will be carried in the regular appropriation bill will appear in the bill for the independent offices, which bill already has passed the House of Representatives, or is just about ready to pass?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. The appropriation will not be held up this year, as the general appropriation bill was held up last year, by reason of the fact that everything was contained in a single bill.

Mr. CORDON. Let me interrupt the Senator to correct the RECORD. The appropriation in the bill coming over from the House will be in the labor and Federal security bill, and not in the independent offices bill. However, that bill has been reported on the other side.

Will the Senator state his second question?

Mr. CASE. The second question was this: The apropriation in that case being handled in a separate and independent bill, it will not be held up waiting for late military estimates, such as those in the general appropriation bill of last year.

Mr. CORDON. There will be no question about that, I think. In the orderly procedure it will be one of the earliest bills on which we shall take action.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that under the language of both the bill and the amendment, the amounts appropriated will be held for this purpose until expended?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. As I understand, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] asked the Senator from Oregon whether or not the $50,000,000 reported by the committee would take care, under the formula, of the districts which had the greatest need. I understood the Senator from Oregon to reply in the affirmative.

Mr. CORDON. The greatest priority, not the greatest need. Need does not enter into the picture at all.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean that the moneys being appropriated are not being appropriated to meet a need?

Mr. CORDON. No question of need is involved.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean that the need does not exist?

Mr. CORDON. Need not appear; and the Government does not inquire into the question.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the school children in the districts which do not have sufficient priority to receive any benefit from the $50,000,000 proposed to be appropriated in the bill have just as great a need for the opportunity for education as do children in those districts which happen to have priority?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the question answers itself. Every child has the same need for education, rich or poor, wherever he may be, in the North, East, South, or West. There is no question there to answer.

Mr. KERR. Then does not the Senator feel that those in districts other than the ones taken care of by the bill are just as much entitled to have their needs met as those who are in districts taken care of in the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has not discussed that matter at all. He answered a question as to where the money would be applied; and the law itself makes that provision. The Senator from Oregon only happened to vote for it.

Mr. President, I want to make this perfectly clear. My interest is in the school child. I want to see that the school child gets his break. I am inclined to believe that we made a mistake when we passed the act, so far as that is concerned. I think we should have had need as a part of our yardstick. It is not that. The yardstick is percentage of children of one class as compared to all. That percentage is applied and the money is available, even though the district itself might be endowed with funds enough so that it could educate the children without even having recourse to taxes.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator taking the position that the money should be made available for one class and not for another which has an equal need?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has not taken any such position, and from nothing that he said could it be implied that he has.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for another question, and I hope it is more to the point than the last one was.

Mr. KERR. Does the fact that the schools in the State of Oregon get upward of three-quarters of a million dollars under the $50,000,000 as contained in the bill reported by the committee and would receive less than $100,000 additional from the additional amount proposed by the committee amendment, have anything to do with the Senator's position with reference to making appropriation for one class and denying it to another?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I want to say that that is the same implication that was contained in a question asked a while ago, and in my opinion it is contemptible. The Senator from Oregon does not know what will come to the State of Oregon under the $50,000,000 contained in the committee amendment nor what would come to the State of Oregon under the $50,000,000 that the Senator from Oklahoma wants to add to that, except that the Senator from Oklahoma sent the Senator from Oregon a statement indicating that some additional districts would come in, undoubtedly with the thought that he would get a vote for them.

I yield no further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon refuses to yield. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think we can maintain this debate where it ought to be—on a factual and logical basis. I still have the belief——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a point of personal privilege.

Mr. CORDON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. KERR. A point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I still believe that this debate can be carried on on a sound and logical and impersonal basis. I hope to remain there. I want to give notice, however, Mr. President, that when charges, whether couched in questions or otherwise, are directed at my integrity, I shall answer them, and I shall not hesitate about doing it. I shall not direct them to another. I concede to my colleagues high purpose in the service of the Government. I hope that we may have the same concession from them.

Mr. President, getting back to this matter, there is one provision in the law that I think has not been given appropriate consideration. That is section 203 of the act. I hope I may have the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. His colleague is not present at the moment. I believe this is of some importance to the Senator, who spoke about this matter, and to all my colleagues who are present on the floor or who may be on the floor later, and who have this problem—the lack of adequate facilities for taking care of the heavy influx of school children due to the temporary dislocations of the war.

Section 203, Mr. President, has to do with those situations where the Federal activities involved will be temporary, as distinguished from settled and permanent operations. In those instances the applicable law is as follows—and I want to read section 203 into the RECORD at this time:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 202, whenever the Commissioner determines that part or all of the attendance with respect to which any local educational agency is entitled to receive payment under such section will be of temporary duration only, such agency shall not be entitled to receive such payment with respect to the attendance so determined to be of temporary duration only. Instead, the Commissioner shall make available to such agency such temporary school facilities as may be necessary to take care of such attendance; except that he may, where the local educational agency gives assurance that adequate school facilities will be provided to take care of such attendance, pay (on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title) to such agency for use in constructing school facilities an amount equal to the amount which he estimates would be necessary to make available such temporary facilities.

Mr. President, I want to carry my thought a little further for the benefit of those who have this tragic situation of heavy influx of school children for temporary facilities. I am of the opinion, Mr. President, that the present law is inadequate to reach conditions which arise under section 203 because in those instances, irrespective of what the State might be able to do by changing its laws, by increasing its ceilings for expenditure and so forth, it simply cannot meet the conditions that arise almost overnight and before any action of any kind in the legislative field could be taken, and it finds itself as we found ourselves in my own State in World War II, with a heavy influx of children and no possibility of handling their education necessities; when we were compelled to appeal to the Government, did appeal, and did receive some relief. That was true in other sections of the Nation.

It is my thought, Mr. President, that we need amendatory legislation that will give to the Security Agency the power in those cases where this influx is temporary, and without prior notice, and when there is no other way in which this educational necessity can be met, discretion to vary the priorities to reach even the 30 percent or the 25 percent, and I believe that when that is done, a part of the determination should rest upon the financial need of the district itself to pay the bill. If we can get that done, we can write humanity as well as logic into this measure.

That matter should have further consideration, Mr. President. It can receive adequate consideration by the appropriate committee at the proper time. I believe that even though we are compelled to request the indulgence of the Senate to write legislation into an appropriation bill, the Senate should agree to do so, in accordance with the rule.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to state my understanding of the purpose of this amendment. I understand that the purpose is that in an area where there is a sudden influx of children of school age, because of the necessary emergency increase of Federal Government activities in that area, the Federal Commissioner of Education can meet such temporary need without receiving help from the local community, insofar as the need is temporary and insofar as meeting the need is necessary because of the emergency. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not that the purpose of this provision? It will not require any local contribution at all, will it?

Mr. CORDON. I am not quite sure that I follow the Senator, if he is referring to section 203.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am referring to section 203, which I have before me. As I read it, its purpose is to provide for meeting a sudden need for school facilities in an area where the activities of the Federal Government have increased or have developed very quickly and may be only temporary.

Mr. CORDON. Yes; that is the purpose. However, neither that section nor any part of this bill gives the Administrator authority to consider the financial stringency which may rest on a given district, although that district may have a much smaller increase, percentagewise, in the children of school age who come there because of the activities of the Federal Government in connection with the war emergency than some other district has; but it may be in such a financial condition that its situation is far worse, with the result that some children of school age will not be able to get proper educational opportunities. That is a matter which I think should receive early attention.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement the Senator from Oregon has just made.

I wish the record to show that personally I am anxious to assist in any way I can to correct the situation which is causing difficulty in my State and, I am sure, in other States. I believe that the way now proposed is the only available way by which the Senate can act immediately in regard to this matter.

I am indebted to the Senator from Oregon not only for his splendid statement but also for the able manner in which he has proceeded in regard to this matter as a whole.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Kansas.

If the method now proposed, Mr. President, were the only one by which we could provide these funds, I should support the amendment. But there is an orderly way by means of which we can make these funds available, and it should be followed.

I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment, on page 12, beginning in line 10, striking out in line 15 the numerals "$50,000,000" and inserting "$100,000,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words in regard to this item. It has come to the Senate Appropriations Committee with a recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has stated, in practically all instances of which I am aware the Bureau of the Budget considers such matters adequately and fairly. I have never known the Bureau of the Budget—except in a few instances which are so rare that I could not name them if I were asked to—to err on the low side in recommending appropriations in connection with such matters. It is very rare for the Bureau of the Budget to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Are not these funds to be administered by the Office of Education? Once the Bureau of the Budget makes its recommendation as to what it regards as the proper amount of the appropriation, the Office of Education is not able to appear before the Appropriations Committee and recommend any other amount, is it, until the Bureau of the Budget changes the amount it recommends? Is not that the practical application of the law?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly that is the way the matter works out. The answer

to the Senator's question appears on page 563 of the hearings, from which I now read:

Dr. LINDMAN. Our request was for $100,000,000. Fifty million dollars was allowed by the Budget Bureau.

Senator HAYDEN. You are here justifying that?

Dr. LINDMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Under the practice, the Office of Education is permitted to justify before the Appropriations Committee only an amount up to $50,000,000, under those circumstances; is he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I do not know that that is required by law, but certainly it is required by Executive order.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the record which has been stated shows that of the appropriations made to date, namely, $49,500,000, as of the end of March—or a little over 1 month ago—there had been obligated only $1,306,600, and there had been expended only $227,729. So of course there is a considerable leeway in connection with the funds currently appropriated.

If we now add $50,000,000 to those funds, certainly it would seem to me that would be sufficient during the interim period to enable the agency to continue its work.

I do not challenge the merit of this proposal, which would necessitate the use of funds in excess of the appropriation in cases where the need is great; but I believe this agency will have sufficient funds if in this supplemental appropriation bill we provide the $50,000,000, which then will be available in addition to the unexpended and unobligated balances.

I should like to make a further point which to some extent has been lost sight of, I believe. It is that the amendment proposed on page 12 is to the committee amendment reading in part as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Grants for surveys and school construction

For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and school construction," to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities.

In other words, so far as I know, that language would provide the President of the United States with rather blanket power to determine how the funds should be distributed. Unless those who anticipate what they will receive for certain projects in their State or for certain areas in their State, by means of that provision, if it is made, have been foreadvised by the President or by the Commissioner of Education, predicated upon what he knows or believes the President will do, I do not know how such persons are able to say what their States or such areas in their States will receive.

I have been rather surprised to find that attempts have been made to determine the amounts of money which will go to particular States in that connection. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question in that connection, if I may do so.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Oklahoma whatever time he requires to answer my question. Let me say to him that the committee amendment provides that the Commissioner of Education shall determine what amounts are necessary to "be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities."

I have heard many rumors, I may say to the Senator, as to what certain States will receive, provided the additional $50,000,000 is appropriated. I wonder how the Senator from Oklahoma has been able to look into a crystal ball and has obtained that information, when the legislation in connection with this matter has not even been enacted.

Mr. KERR. In response to the question of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I must say that I was impressed by the fact that, so far, most of what has been stated in the debate on the floor has been stated by Senators who come from States which will not receive any of the additional $50,000,000, if it is made available.

Mr. BRIDGES. How does the Senator know they will not receive any of it?

Mr. KERR. Because I have been furnished information——

Mr. BRIDGES. By whom?

Mr. KERR. By distinguished school administrators who have been providing me and other Senators with this information. They have furnished me information as to what amounts are necessary to be appropriated in order to implement this program with reference to the schools which are eligible under the authorization bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is predicated on two unknown factors, is it not?

Mr. KERR. It is predicated upon the application of the formula as arrived at and applied by the Office of Education.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it not also predicated on whether the President should designate the area to which they applied as a critical area, based upon considerations of national defense?

Mr. KERR. It is based on the practice with reference to the designation of an area, and the formula for determining eligibility, now in force, as it has been provided by the Office of Education. As the Senator knows, the law provides that, before a school district may become eligible for one dollar of Federal funds, it must have exhausted all the funds which it can appropriate for itself from local sources of revenue, and that, subject to correction, though I am convinced I am substantially correct, in the the over-all picture, as I understand, the practice has been followed that the local districts have furnished about one-third of the cost of additional construction, the Federal Government having furnished the other two-thirds. However, in certain instances, the Federal Government has furnished all the cost, because the particular local district had exhausted its own revenue from local sources.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has answered my question as to whether he obtained this information by looking into a crystal ball. But I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether his information is not certainly of an informal nature, and is derived from informal sources, rather than being official and based on a factual agreement as to how the money shall be spent.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct in his statement that the information has been informally compiled and informally secured. But the Senator from Oklahoma assures the Senator from New Hampshire that, to the very best of his ability, he has secured accurate information and applicable information.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would be to the advantage of the Senate if this information were made available.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator like to have the information showing what is available to each of the States, on the basis of this formula?

Mr. BRIDGES. The point I was endeavoring to make in my remarks is that it should have been submitted to the Appropriations Committee, in order that we might have had the picture before us. I am glad to get it from the Senator even in an informal way, but the Appropriations Committee should have had this information, if it was available. The Senator from Oklahoma, by his very aggressive interest in this project, has succeeded in acquiring these figures to his own satisfaction. Whether the members of the committee would place credence in them, after having had an opportunity to question those who presented the facts and figures, may be very much open to question. My point is that when we are required to resort to an informal presentation, on the floor, of figures gathered by a United States Senator, on his own initiative, without their having been referred to a committee, the measure under consideration being a supplemental bill—there is certainly an added reason why we should back the committee and keep the sum at $50,000,000, rather than increase it to $100,000,000.

There may be a reason, when the evidence is all in the record, for providing more funds in the next bill. I think there is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to provide funds, when, by our defense activities, we have so expanded the problem in a community that an unusual, undue, and almost impossible hardship will be placed on the community if it is required to provide the school facilities to which all American children are entitled.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate listened to the evidence. It had before it the requests of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget is an arm of the executive branch of the Government. We assume that the President approved the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. The committee, after hearing all the evidence, decided that the Bureau of the

Budget was right, and it recommended $50,000,000 in full, in this case. The committee did that, recognizing that the appropriations for this item had previously been $49,500,000, and that, as of March 31, 1951, only $1,306,600 had been obligated, and but $227,729 spent. With that amount of leeway, plus the $50,000,000 provided in this bill, it would seem as if, in this supplemental bill, and in the interim period, we had provided enough to enable them to go ahead and to meet the most urgent needs of the program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Under the authorization law, did not the districts have until April 6 to file applications?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not remember the exact date. I think the Senator is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. KERR. The small amount which may have been allocated since that date, in view of the information to which the Senator is referring, is due to the lateness in starting on the part of the Office of Education, with respect to processing the applications after the cut-off date, rather than to any shortage in the amount of money applied for under the law; is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is probably correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator mentioned the amount recommended by the Director of the Budget, and stated that the committee appropriated the full amount. If we should go beyond the recommendation of the Director of the Budget, and lift the ceiling, we would be going beyond the amount which the administration, through the Director of the Budget, believed could properly be spent in the period for which the funds are appropriated; would we not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is our assumption, and it is the only assumption upon which we can proceed, because that is what we are told in connection with all appropriations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we were to go beyond that, we should then be going beyond the justifications, at least as submitted by the Director of the Budget, even though the agency making the request might itself feel that it could spend more; but we would be going beyond the balanced needs of the administration; would we not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator knows, we had a brief discussion a while ago about the Bureau of the Budget and about the Office of Education, which handles the money in the item under discussion. We discussed the possibility of the Office of Education being cut off, once the Budget Bureau had fixed this figure. This is a little unusual, but I have direct information from the Office of Education as to the status of the surveys, which subject came up a moment ago. I am told that all those surveys are completed, that there are 750 applications now on file, and that this money can be allocated within a matter of a few days. From the nature of the construction, I think it is certainly true that it would be spent within a matter of a few months, a great deal of it on renovating old buildings and in erecting annexes to existing buildings.

I appreciate very much the fairness of the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from New Hampshire, all three of whom spoke at length. They all admit the need. I wish to point out again, if I may, that time is of the essence in this matter, in view of the problem which exists by reason of the emergency. The need is admitted, and the reasonableness of the figure is admitted. So I submit to the Senator from New Hampshire that there is no reason for delaying this matter may further. It is urgent that the amendment be put into the bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Mississippi and to the Senator from Oklahoma that in the Appropriation Committee hearing it was brought out that on March 12, 1951, a total of 697 school districts had made applications for Federal assistance for the construction of school facilities under section 202 of Public Law 815. Of this number, 528 districts had submitted 915 construction projects, requesting $180,000,000 of Federal funds, and had pledged approximately $93,000,000 in local funds.

My point is that apparently the Bureau of the Budget had all this information in its hands before it agreed upon the request for $50,000,000.

May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the later figures he has change the figures I quoted to any appreciable extent?

Mr. KERR. The figures stated by the Senator are accurate, I believe. I think there is another figure which we might take into account. On the same date there had either been contemplated for approval or approved $51,000,000 worth of construction on military reservations which, under the law, are first taken care of. So, that being the case, to some extent that figure would influence the amount which would be available for districts other than those on military reservations.

In further answer to the Senator's question, the figures given by the Senator from Oklahoma were of a later date than March 12.

Mr. WHERRY (and other Senators). Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The "yeas" seem to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. KERR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Millikin
Anderson	Green	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Moody
Benton	Hendrickson	Morse
Brewster	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Humphrey	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Duff	Lodge	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	McClellan	Tobey
Ellender	McFarland	Underwood
Ferguson	McKellar	Welker
Flanders	McMahon	Wherry
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on behalf of himself and other Senators to the committee amendment on page 12, line 10.

Mr. KERR and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on May 1, 1951, when I was absent from the Senate, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] attacked a statement which I made before the United States Chamber of Commerce on April 30, claiming it was illogical and irrational and had other unpleasant features, and that it was inconsistent with my support of General MacArthur's program for releasing the Chinese Nationalist troops to assist in the war against the Chinese Communists.

In order that there may be no doubt about what I said, I ask that there be incorporated as part of my remarks the address which I made to the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce on April 30, 1951, at the Statler Hotel. It seems to have annoyed the Senator from Connecticut that the audience should have cheered me at the conclusion of the speech, but I am quite willing to stand by everything I said at that time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator TAFT. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, it is always a great pleasure to come to the meetings of the United States Chamber of Commerce. It certainly is by far the greatest representative body of businessmen in the world today. Of course, among them I find differences on questions of political importance, varying all the way from one side to the other. I even find on matters of legislative policy a certain amount of

differences among the members of the chamber of commerce. There are those, as in other fields of life, who are for outright battle and those who are for appeasement and those who are for moderate courses. I have found, I think, that when we get questions of controls, they become fairly unanimous [laughter]. When we get to taxation, they are practically unanimous in a little different way. They are all in favor of balancing the budget, and of course of bearing their fair share of taxation, but there is a particular application to their own industry, or their own position, of which they are very much concerned and which they think is against the public interest [laughter].

I have about come to the same conclusion as General Hancock on the subject of the tariff, that taxation is perhaps a local and personal issue.

I find one other phase of almost unanimous agreement, and that is on questions of labor policy.

In any event, I have had tremendous pleasure in dealing with the representatives of the chamber. Like many of the so-called lobbying organizations, their representatives are as much concerned, I find, in the public interest as they are in their own selfish interests. [Applause.] That particular kind of legislative or lobbying organization, if you want to call it that, is of particularly great value to those of us in Congress. It is impossible for us to know the facts. Those arguments must be presented to us, as arguments in court are presented to a judge, in the most concise manner and with the most effective argument in order that we can judge and reach a correct conclusion on the public issues before us.

To the questions of foreign policy I certainly do not claim to be an expert. People have accused me of moving into foreign policy. The fact is that foreign policy moved in on me. [Laughter.] There is no issue before this Congress that is not dictated by considerations of foreign policy, no domestic issue that is not finally determined by such issues. We have had a tremendous excitement because of the resentment among the people against the dismissal of General MacArthur, and of course far-eastern policy has arisen therefore into tremendous importance and one of pressing importance because of the war, and yet I think we must realize that after all Korea is only one phase of a very much larger problem that we face today.

That problem is produced by the threat of Russian aggression. Perhaps the first time since the days of the early Republic when we faced the whole force of the British Empire, a small Nation along the Atlantic coast, perhaps the first time since, there is a serious threat to the liberty of the people of the United States. As your representative has said, liberty is not only the key to domestic policy, but it is also the key of foreign policy. The liberty of the people of the United States must be the aim of foreign policy, not any general hope. Of course we wish to raise the standards of the world and everything else, but our considerations of foreign policy particularly when we come to the question of war must be determined solely by the desire and the determination to secure the liberty of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Peace is almost as great an aim but after all, we have gone to war to protect our liberty in the past, and we will in the future. But certainly also, it seems to me we should never risk war except to protect the liberty of the people of this country, for war itself can destroy our liberty at home, and the outcome of war may easily destroy the liberty of our people from abroad.

The Russian threat today is great because of the narrowing of the world, because the air force can fly now from Russia to the United States, because they have the atomic bomb, because they are able to do great damage to this country in a way in which even Mr. Hitler never had the opportunity of doing. It is because it is linked up with the aggressive force of communism itself, which undertakes to infiltrate successfully with propaganda and actual personal infiltration into foreign governments and create a fifth column to support the military aggression.

Why we are there I don't want to discuss today. It is my own opinion that the policy of this Government from the days beginning at Tehran and Yalta, from the attitude of mind which apparently thought that if you gave Mr. Stalin everything he wanted he would turn out to be an angel, to the attitude of mind which accepted communism as, after all, just another form of democracy—according to Henry Wallace, a little better than our form of democracy, perhaps—I think that that attitude of mind succeeded in building up this Russian threat. [Applause.]

I think it put Russia in control in central Europe, in Prague and Vienna, and in Berlin, where they need not have been, to dominate central Europe and threaten the security of Western Europe, and therefore of the United States. It put Russia into Manchuria, from which they were able to arm the Chinese Communists and support the movement which finally has given a completely Communist domination on the continent of Asia, working down toward even the southeast section of that continent.

However we got there, we are there today, and we have the problem of deciding how we meet that threat.

On the general principles of that decision, I don't think that there is any tremendous difference of opinion. I think it is clear, and I think the generally accepted proposal by all parties and practically all elements of the population of this country is that we oppose the spread of communism at every point where it can be opposed and by every means within our capacity to oppose it. I think we have adopted those policies, and we have supported other nations, with economic aid, in order that they may achieve the prosperity that will prevent the spread of communism within those countries.

We have given arms aid to various nations where we think that there is a threat, a direct threat of Russian aggression. We have sent our troops to some places. We have undertaken in the Atlantic Pact to go to war if Russia attacks certain parts of the world.

Those general policies, I think, are not particularly disputed today. The great differences of opinion have arisen in the application of those policies.

First of all, I think we must consider the necessary limitations on the ability of the United States to carry out the program. We can only undertake those things within our ability, and, after all, we only have 6 percent of the population of the world, less than half of the total production. And, powerful as we are, great as is our production, there is a limit to our capacity.

I have felt very strongly, myself, that if we go beyond that limit, we may stretch our efforts to a point where they will fail. It seems to me that the one thing we have to fear in the long run—I have no fear about our ability to defend the United States, even though it might be damaged. The only thing which may wreck this country is what has wrecked many other countries: the fact that we assume more than we can possibly do. Germany is in ruins today because Hitler thought that he could conquer the world. Japan is in ruins because they thought that they could conquer the Far East. There isn't anything which can destroy this country except going further than we are able to go considering our ability.

My principal criticism of the administration is that there does not seem to be anybody who has, so to speak, put together the various phases of this program, who has considered all of its implications, who has considered where it is going or even exactly what it shall be.

I think today what we need more than anything else is a definite program of foresightedness, looking ahead 2 or 3 or 4 years to see what we can do, and then decide among those things offered to us what is within our proper capacity.

It nearly all depends upon our military effort. That is the tremendous strain upon the economy of the United States. I do not think that aid to foreign countries will be too great a strain. Aid to foreign countries, of course, imposes some additional burden, and there may be a great difference as to just what that aid shall be and where. And yet, when you get down to dollars and cents, it is a small item compared to the total effort that we have.

It is easiest to measure by the number of men in the Armed Forces of the United States. What is the program? And what is it going to be 12 months from now?

Before the Korean war we were told by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that 1,500,000 men were approximately sufficient to provide an adequate defense for the people of the United States. We were told that they would not think of recommending $20,000,000,000 for Armed Forces, and they ought to be dismissed if they asked for $30,000,000,000.

Then came the Korean war. Of course, that was a revelation. It showed that the Russians were not averse to using their satellite troops at least for direct military attack. At least it woke the people up, but it did not create a substantially different situation.

The fact that they were able to use satellite troops, I do not think proves one way or the other whether they are prepared to start a third world war and use their own troops in that effort. Nevertheless, it naturally drew attention to the matter. And after that attack, within a month or so, we were asked for 2,100,000 men. Then we got back here in December and the program presented to us was for 2,700,000 men. Within 30 days, when we came back in January, it was 3,500,000 men. And there, for the moment, it rests, although I do not think that necessarily that presents the limit of what may be asked.

Of course, that factor determines all of the other important things, and it determines the draft and it determines whether we have to take 18-year-old boys, or 18½, or 19, and whether we have to take men for 21 months, 24 months, 27 months for continuous service. And it means that, even at the 3,500,000 figure, that every boy in this country is going to have to give 2 years of full military service in order to provide the Armed Forces that are now requested.

Of course, it determines the amount of expense, and it determines the amount of taxes. It determines, therefore, the severity and the character of the controls which have to be imposed.

Those are the main questions before Congress.

The Korean War has no great bearing on that total question, because out of these 3,500,000 men we are using 350,000 altogether, probably, in the Korean War, and we are told that that is all we have to use.

So that this is a much broader question. This is a question of what is necessary to meet the Russian threat.

I say it is very difficult to get anyone who will sit down and tell you what this is going to cost for the next 2 or 3 years. As far as I can judge, and I admit I am more or less guessing on it, 3,500,000 men will cost $35,000,000,000 a year continuously, just to maintain them and for travel and for the operations of the force and replace clothes and perhaps ordinary arms.

In addition to that, however, apparently for 3 years we are going to have to spend

attack by Russia? Is it not true that the Security Council is the only possible body in the United Nations that could act?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that comment from the Senator from Missouri, because it again points up some of the weaknesses in the structure of the United Nations organization.

At this time, Mr. President, may I pay a well-earned tribute to our Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, who saw that possibility and just did not talk about it, but went to the United Nations and got a resolution passed by the Assembly so that the Assembly can act by a two-thirds vote, thereby to circumvent the Security Council. That is the same Acheson who is supposed to be a Communist appeaser, who has taken a beating day after day on this floor. But he saw fit to get a resolution agreed to which does make the United Nations an instrumentality that can act in a situation like that to which the Senator from Missouri has referred.

Mr. President, in talking about our Allies, I want to say that if I had my choice between Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists on Formosa and the British Commonwealth, or Great Britain, as an ally, a choice which I hope will not be forced upon us, I would join up with Great Britain. Not that she is as good as we would sometimes want her to be, but she is the second most powerful nation among the free nations of the world. She is our No. 1 ally. It is ridiculous to cost aside one ally to pick up an uncertain entity. I will place the record of Great Britain as a great nation against the record of leadership of any of our other allies. The 13 nations in the North Atlantic Pact represent a major portion of the free world. They are joined with us in common principles, common culture, common law; they are our people in the sense that they believe in peace, freedom, and democracy, and we should stand with them and not abuse them.

Mr. President, may I summarize by pointing out that it is a disservice to the cause of peace, a disservice to the cause of victory, to say that our policy has been one of appeasement? I submit that the record of this Government as a leader in the United Nations, as a leader of the free nations of the world, is a record of which we can be justly proud. It is a record of uniting the free world to resist the onslaught of Communist aggression. The President, the Secretary of State, and the leadership in the House and the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, have given direction to this program. I submit, Mr. President, that it is at least a paradox in argument to say, on the one hand, that we are at war, and, on the other hand, to say that we are at peace.

My position is what it was 2 years ago, namely, that our real enemy is the Soviet Union. Let us not forget that. Let us not get ourselves embroiled in an expanding war only to find out that we can never get out of it. Let us keep our eyes on where the real source of power is. If we bomb bases in Manchuria we must also go back to Moscow. That is where the supplies are coming from. May I suggest that before we make that trip, we had better check our luggage; we had better be sure we can get there; we had better be sure of our time, our strength, and our strategy.

It boils down, then, to this, that the policy which the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Marshall, has been defending is one of sound strategy. It is a policy which is based upon building up the strength of the Nation without wrecking its economy. It is a policy of building up the strength of our allies without wrecking their economy, so that we may stand together as one great, mighty force. It is a policy of recognizing that we cannot have unity of effort unless there is a spirit of cooperation. We cannot always have our way. Our allies are free and independent nations. They are not satellites. We must expect that our allies are going to have differences of opinion with us. In any free state there are differences of opinion. If the choice I have to make is between having allies who disagree with us once in a while and having stooges who agree every time we crack the whip, I would choose the allies.

Mr. President, I plead with my colleagues that we not put ourselves into a position of taking some precipitate action before we are ready for that action. It is ridiculous to do so. We are not yet strong enough. But our strength is growing, and our adversary knows it. It will continue to grow so long as we remain united not only in our own country, but with the free nations of the world.

I plead for national unity not only to bind up the wounds in our own country, but I plead for the unity which we must have amoung our friends and allies.

Let us dedicate our efforts to the cause of peace. Let us think about what we may do to seek peace. Let us dedicate ourselves and our efforts to seeing how we can strengthen the United Nations to make it a strong instrumentality for law and order. Let us think in terms of what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon] proposed some time ago and what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Flanders] proposed, universal disarmament, and the dedication of some of our treasure, our gifts, and our abundance to building up the standard of living in the world. I should like to be in the Senate at a time when this country can honestly say it has led the peoples of the world in the path of peace. The people in this country are sick of war, Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The people of our own country are anxious to be given ideals and goals which lead to peace. They do not want an extension of the war. They want a conclusion of it on honorable and just terms. I submit, Mr. President, that that is exactly what Secretary Marshall has been talking about, and that is the goal toward which the President has been directing his efforts.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have yielded the floor, but I shall be glad to accommodate my friend from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I was very much intrigued by what the Senator from Minnesota had to say about the necessity, if we start to Moscow, of checking our luggage. I have been interested in what he has had to say about the desire of the American people to preserve peace. I do not exactly understand how the Senator would reconcile his views in this respect with his declaration today that the United States would go to war in a minute if India were attacked by Russia or by Communist China. Does the Senator feel that in that event it would not be necessary for us to check our luggage to be sure we had enough to get us to Moscow?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to talk to the Senator about our traveling accommodations. What I was pointing out was that this country has been requested to give foodstuffs to India. I was saying that a deal in that respect might be looked upon by some persons with a certain amount of disdain. I was merely saying that if some nations should call upon us for arms we would give them quickly, as we usually do. I was asking our Government to provide as expeditiously the food and the grain to keep people alive as we would provide guns and munitions to see that people are killed. I should like to have the privilege of working in the vineyard of peace. We have a war college; we have a West Point, and it appears to me that it would be well for the Members of the House and the Senate to spend some time considering how we can obtain a just and enduring peace, rather than how we can extend the conflict.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has yielded the floor.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope we can reach a vote on the pending amendment at this time, and I hope we can then finish the consideration of the bill. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. Gillette], who is in charge of the bill to furnish emergency food aid to India, advises me that he prefers that Senate bill 872 await action by the House of Representatives, and suggests that it go over until after they have concluded their consideration of it.

I understand there is not very much more to be done on the appropriation

bill this afternoon, and if we could finish its consideration we would make House bill 1612 to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements, the unfinished business, and then adjourn until Monday. If we can get a little cooperation, Senators will not have to return until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment on page 12, line 15, to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000." On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], have been appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of Hon. John Kee, late a Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] arranged to pair today with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]. However, on this vote both the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business. If present, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is absent on official business and arranged to pair today with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. However, on this vote both Senators, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—35

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Benton	Humphrey	Moody
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Connally	Kefauver	Russell
Eastland	Kerr	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
George	Long	Sparkman
Green	McClellan	Stennis
Hennings	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	

NAYS—41

Aiken	Flanders	O'Conor
Bennett	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hayden	Robertson
Bridges	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Smith, N. C.
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Case	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Tobey
Dirksen	McCarthy	Welker
Douglas	McMahon	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Ellender	Martin	Young
Ferguson	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—20

Brewster	Ives	Millikin
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chavez	Kilgore	Nixon
Duff	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ecton	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Wiley
Hunt	Maybank	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KERR, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to committee amendment on page 12, after line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I yield if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may do so. The Senator from Nebraska will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that conclude all the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes consideration of all the committee amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

MRS. CLAIRE PHILLIPS CLAVIER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a few miscellaneous matters which I wish to place in the RECORD at this time.

First, I wish to make a very brief announcement in regard to a distinguished citizen of my State, Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier, who was one of the great American spies during World War II. Her spy activities occurred in the Philippines, where she was of great service to our country. As I understand, she is credited by the Military Establishment with being responsible for saving a great many American lives and giving information which resulted in the destruction of a great many enemy lives, as well as the destruction of a great deal of our enemy's war matériel.

She certainly is a courageous American. She is now visiting Washington in connection with the world premiere of a motion picture which is based upon her spy activities in the Philippines. The picture is entitled "I Was an American Spy."

For her work she has received the Medal of Freedom from our Government, the only woman to have received it. It was presented to her by Gen. Mark Clark upon the recommendation of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, with the approval of the President of the United States. I can tell the Senate in all sincerity that the motion picture depicting her activities as a spy in the Philippines is one of the truest portrayals I have witnessed on the screen. This picture has been honored by having a prologue and an epilog delivered by Gen. Mark W. Clark, Chief, Army Field Forces.

This great citizen of my State, Mrs. Clavier, is the subject of a bill which has been pending before the Senate for a couple of years, and which I reintroduced this year. I refer to Senate bill 911, a bill which seeks only to authorize her to bring legal action against the United States Government for the recovery of at least a part of the funds which she spent in her spy activities in the Philippines.

She first represented herself to the Japanese as an Italian citizen, and showed the appropriate forged papers which made it possible for her to get by with that identification for some time. But, of course, as the Italian situation changed, she then had to place herself in the position of being a national of another country. She was finally detected by the Japanese and put through all the various tortures the Japanese knew so very well how to use in the handling of military and spy prisoners.

However, the record shows, Mr. President, that she disposed of great quantities of her valuable possessions, including her jewels, and the return that she received from these properties was used in order to buy the matériel that she was able to smuggle into the hills of the Philippines to be used there by the guerrilla forces and the American rangers who were in those hills, including, for example, the obtaining by purchase from Japanese parties, so I understand, a very much needed set of radio equipment which she used for transmitting purposes in notifying American naval officials of the time of departure from Manila of a large Japanese naval force. I understand that the information which was sent over the radio transmit-

by current history. It is far better that the Treasury and Federal Reserve authorities, men patriotic, honest, and sincere, viewing the problem from different angles, should debate until they come to a decision in the public interest as they see it, than that either should be given power to control the other.

The Treasury is wrong in this case; but the Federal Reserve is not infallible. In 1920, 1929, and 1937 the Board showed notable unconsciousness of the violence, of the lethal nature, of the weapons which Congress had given them, and a marked tendency to go to extremes in their use. The present Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, and the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, are men of wisdom and moderation, but the Washington Board still includes in its membership men who sponsored the disastrous increase in member bank reserve requirements in 1937; and the Board has asked of Congress power to require member banks to increase reserves still further in cash and Government securities (up to 61 percent in central Reserve cities) in order to enable the Federal Reserve to buy up the funded debt, if need be, to keep it at par or better. On the whole, in view of its record, it seems just as well that the Federal Reserve has to consult and get along with the political authorities. I see no reason to grant the Federal Reserve power to override the Secretary of the Treasury, or vice versa. I think they should compose their differences, after fighting it out as equals.

But the course which the Federal Reserve authorities are pursuing of very gently pressing up the level of interest rates is correct. It is intended to exert a steady pressure with a view to preventing a further expansion, and, on the other hand, avoiding contraction. That is a fair-money policy. It is to be hoped that the Secretary will consent to yield to them the moderate increase in interest rates suggested.

CONCLUSION

We must do everything we can to avoid inflation and cut out avoidable or deferable or wasteful nonmilitary expenditures; but let us not be frightened by the expense of war or rearmament. In view of our great gold reserve, which is so vital to insure our buying power abroad, and more than ever precious as a war chest, there is no financial limit to the ability of the people, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve banks and the member banks to meet the Government's defense needs or war needs. War is economic waste. There can be no pay-as-you-go policy in case of general war. But while Russia's rulers follow the self-saving plan of limited war, of war by proxy, we had better pull up our belts, reduce our luxurious civil spending, public and private, increase our taxes and fund our debt, and pay our way from day to day.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD—BOOK BY THOMAS AMLIE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a book, entitled "Let's Look at the Record," which I understand is just off the press. It is written by Thomas Amlie. I have only scanned the book, but it purports to be an analysis of the action of Congress for the past 20 years on some of the key issues which have come before it, issues which in the opinion of Mr. Amlie lay down a line of demarcation between two points of view in the Congress, namely, the point of view which supports a growing trend toward monopolistic control in America and the contrary point of view which seeks to support the exercise of greater economic democracy in the United States, or, as Mr. Amlie points out, the difference between an ultraconservative point of view on the economic front and a so-called liberal point of view.

In making this statement, let me point out that in the introduction to the book, I am not treated in too complimentary a fashion because of my devotion to what I think is a basic tenet of political ethics if one is to hold office in one of our great political parties.

As my colleagues know, I have always held to the point of view that if one holds major political office in either of the two political parties, he has an ethical obligation not to befoul his party's nest in political campaigns by campaigning against his party. I have always said he has the right and, in fact, the duty, if he is to maintain his intellectual honesty, to remain silent in a political campaign if he cannot in good conscience and full honesty support either the platform or the major candidates of his party. Certainly he has that intellectual obligation; and he has no right to remain in his party and then proceed to campaign for the party of the opposition. If he is going to follow that course of action, he should resign from his party and should join the party of the opposition.

Thus, Mr. President, I have always held the point of view that as a liberal Republican, I should always endeavor to support my party in the campaigns and should endeavor to do all I could to get my party into power, and then should endeavor to do what I could to resolve my differences of opinion within the party, and not attempt to do so by way of supporting the opposition.

Regardless of the point of view Mr. Amlie indicates in the beginning of his book as his view of my brand of Republicanism, I wish to say that his book represents a tremendous amount of work, the kind of a digging-out job that is not very often done in checking into the record of the Congress and its Members.

I knew Tom Amlie when I was a student at the University of Oregon. In fact, during one year he and I were members of the same debating team. I considered him then, as I do now, a very good friend. In our student days I did not always agree with him, any more than I agree with all of his views now; but what I know of him as a liberal Republican and what I know of his powers of objectivity cause me to recommend his book to the reading of all Members of the Senate.

He is a very keen scholar. He was a great scholar in student days. After college, he entered into politics; and for one or two terms, as I recall, he was a Member of the House of Representatives from a district in Wisconsin. Since then I understand he has generally retired from political life, and has been devoting most of his time to the practice of law and to writing in the general field of politics.

From my scanning of his book, even though we may disagree with some of the observations he makes in it, I believe that it is worthy of careful reading by all Members of the Senate. I hope it will be made available in the Library of Congress and in other libraries, so that the readers of America can check up on what I think is a remarkably objective study and factual presentation of the voting records of Members of Congress during the past 20 years on the list of major issues which Mr. Amlie has selected for analysis.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHO SERVED IN ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, which was, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

> That any person who shall have served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, subject to other provisions of law and veterans' regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, be entitled to benefits of medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, burial benefits, and they and their dependents shall be entitled to compensation or pension provided by law for persons who served during the period of World War II.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that very little has been added to the joint resolution by way of amendment on the part of the House of Representatives. Burial expenses have been expressly enumerated, and also pensions for the widows and orphans of deceased soldiers in the Korean area. That is the real gist of the amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask that the language be read once more? There is no objection, and the motion has been agreed to, but I should merely like to know what the language is.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator that while the House struck out all after the enacting clause, it retained the Senate joint resolution and added two things.

Mr. WHERRY. What were those two things?

Mr. GEORGE. A provision relating to burial expenses and one with regard to widows' and orphans' pensions.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that all?

Mr. GEORGE. That was all. Otherwise, it remains the same.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, so many Senators are asking me what is to be done next, that it is creating considerable confusion. I should merely like to advise Senators on the minority side that we expect to remain here until a vote is had upon the pending bill. I hope that every Senator will remain on the floor, because it is impossible to tell when a vote is going to be had on anything. I hope Senators will remain on the Senate floor until the bill has either been finally passed or defeated.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF LT. GEN. MATTHEW BUNKER RIDGWAY TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I submit a favorable report on the nomination of Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, of the Army of the United States, Commander in Chief in the Far East, to the grade of General, under the provisions of sections 504 and 505 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is before the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, the junior Senator from Washington rises to urge the immediate confirmation by the Senate of the nomination of Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway to the grade of General in the United States Army.

General Ridgway's nomination was forwarded to the Senate yesterday by the President of the United States and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The Armed Services Committee is generally guided by a policy which requires that all nominations of general and flag officers remain before the committee for a week, in order that questions concerning any nominee may be raised and settled. In the case of General Ridgway, the committee considers that the policy should be waived for cause.

As the Senate knows, General Ridgway became the commanding general of the Eighth Army in Korea shortly after the distressing death of General Walker. General Ridgway is now Acting Supreme Commander of American Forces in the Far East. He is also Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in the Far East, and he is also the United Nations Commander, and is responsible for our occupation policies throughout Japan. Since last December, General Ridgway, in the performance of his duties, has conclusively answered every conceivable question which might be raised about his capacity, courage, background, and leadership. The right to his fourth star has been earned by General Ridgway in the sight and presence of the enemy and of the free world.

General Ridgway's nomination comes before us supported by the best wishes and the admiration and respect of military men everywhere, and from those in higher authority within our Nation's Defense Establishment. General Ridgway's nomination bears endorsement by the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Secretary of the Army, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President of the United States.

To my mind, it is proper to make mention of the extremely high regard in which General of the Army Douglas MacArthur holds General Ridgway. In response to a recent question of mine, General MacArthur said:

> General Ridgway was my selection and recommendation as the commander of the Eighth Army after the unfortunate death of that very magnificent soldier, General Walker. I have known General Ridgway for 30 years. I don't think you could have made a more admirable selection in the Far East than General Ridgway. I hold him in the highest esteem not only as a soldier but as a cultured gentleman and one of the most magnificent characters I have ever been acquainted with. I do not know how there could have been any more complete cooperation, devotion, and loyalty both ways than between General Ridgway and myself.

Mr. President, I know that General MacArthur was not speaking alone for himself. He was reflecting the feelings and the appreciation of every individual throughout our forces in Korea.

In this day of trouble and grief and bloodshed, we can count ourselves fortunate in having such leadership available to us as is represented in General Ridgway. He is a combination of the very best qualities which have made our professional officer corps respected throughout the world. As one possessed of greatness, his most noted virtue is that of sharing his capability and determination for victory with others. I know of no man alive who is better equipped to be a General of the Army in a day of crisis than is Matthew Bunker Ridgway.

It seems but yesterday, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Washington was among others who carried out General Ridgway's orders when he was an American corps commander in the European theater in World War II. In that relationship, I gained an everlasting respect and love for General Ridgway as a Christian leader of men and as a man. I am more grateful than I can express to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for permitting me this not-to-be-forgotten opportunity to present the nomination of General Ridgway to the Senate. I know that my sentiments about General Ridgway are shared by every individual who has ever known or come in contact with him. I know that every such person shares my daily prayer that a merciful God will protect General Ridgway and every last man who serves under his command, and will further the holy cause to which General Ridgway and his men have consecrated their lives and our hopes for a world at peace to come. I urge the Senate to confirm the nomination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am privileged to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to join very simply but enthusiastically in what the Senator from Washington has said. I do so because I wish to call to his attention and to the attention of the Senate the fact that General Ridgway received his early grammar-school education in our great English High School at Boston, Mass., a school which has sent many fine men into the service. We are proud of the school, and we are proud of General Ridgway as a product of the school.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have come to know that General Ridgway is a very cultured individual, and it is good now to know whence he acquired a very considerable portion of that culture.

As in executive session, I move that the nomination of General Ridgway be confirmed at this time by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up an amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and myself. It is identified by the date May 9, 1951, and by the letter "B."

The amendment provides that during the period of the present hostilities no economic or financial assistance shall be provided out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, other than military assistance to foreign countries, to any country which continues to ship war materials to Russia, her satellites, or to Communist China.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to state that there is no disagreement with the spirit or intent of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and other Senators. I can state as a certainty that every Senator recognizes the Soviet Union as the cause of the existing cold war. Without inspiration from Moscow there would be no cold war. Every Senator also recognizes that in the event of another world war, the Soviet Union would be the real enemy. Therefore, we all fully support the idea that the export of strategic materials to the Soviet Union and to any and all nations whose governments are allied with the Soviet Union, including China, should and must be cut down to the maximum possible extent. My

criticism is that the amendment does not go far enough, in that it would be effective only while the United States is actually engaged in hostilities.

Another criticism is that it denies economic assistance, but it does not deny military assistance. I cannot understand why we should allow any kind of military assistance to any country to which we are denying economic assistance.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment is in exactly the form proposed by the Senator from Nebraska when his amendment was adopted by the Senate at the last session. I agree with the Senator from Arizona, and I think his criticisms are well taken. So far as I am concerned, with the consent of the other Senators proposing the amendment, I would accept a modification along the lines suggested by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is a question which can properly be taken to conference so that we can determine how to handle it.

The final criticism I have of the amendment is that it is a matter of take it or leave it. I think there might possibly be some modification made which would permit us to do a little Yankee trading. I am sure the conferees would consider it.

Let me read to the Senator the names of the conferees:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and myself.

I think that group representing the Senate will reflect the intent of the Senate with respect to this amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to express the hope that the conferees will bring forth a definite, mandatory provision. At the last session Congress adopted the so-called Cannon amendment which might be aptly characterized as a horse-trading amendment. The National Security Council was given the duty and responsibility of handling the matter. I have been at some pains to find out what the National Security Council has done. So far as my information goes, it has done nothing but negotiate and consider, but not one gun, not one barrel of gasoline, not one ton of rubber has been withheld from the Marshall-plan countries which were shipping materials of that kind to Russia and her satellite nations, including Communist China. What the Senate wants, I think, is a definite, mandatory law, with no ground for horse trading, no ground for discretion, but a definite direction to ECA not to send any materials to Marshall-plan countries or any financial assistance if they are shipping materials of war to Russia or her satellites.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think all Senators thoroughly understand the attitude of the Senator from Missouri and we shall try to reflect that attitude in the conference. I shall be glad, after conferring with a number of the members of the committee, to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to it. I should like to say a word with reference to it, if I may be recognized.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona whether he recalls that during the life of the Marshall plan there have been anywhere from 50 or 60 to 95 trade treaties between the Marshall plan nations and Russia and the iron-curtain countries, providing them with every kind of goods necessary to consolidate their gains in eastern Russia and China, and with which to fight a war. We seem always to get sidetracked on the idea that unless it actually involves a gun with which to shoot, it is not warlike material, when, as a matter of fact, shirt buttons are war material when a war is in progress. The trade treaties to which I refer are actively in operation at the moment. Word came this morning that on the floor of the House of Commons it had been agreed not to ship rubber to Communist China. They have been shipping it ever since World War II closed. China is pretty well loaded up with rubber for a while, so something else will be shipped.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to have that information. I am glad the English have taken definite action. We did not do anything about the matter ourselves until last December. This country continued from June to December to permit such shipments to China.

Mr. MALONE. It was suggested on March 4, 1948, that that was exactly what the Marshall plan would do—arm Russia for a third world war, consolidate her gains, an so forth. The fact that the majority party did not pay any attention to it may be a good excuse at this time, but it was called to the attention of the Senate, and it is still going on. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] has been doing good work in the past 12 to 18 months in connection with the subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have complimented the Senator from Maryland on his good work in that respect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to take only a moment. I appreciate the action of the Senator from Arizona in accepting the amendment. It contains the identical provision which was suggested by the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators last year. When the bill passed the Senate and went to the House we were told the Wherry amendment would be taken to conference for a vote, but it was not considered in conference. It could not be discussed by the conferees until the House could take separate action on it, under a rule similar to that which exists in the Senate.

The conference report and the Wherry amendment were taken to the House for action on September 21, 1950. As a matter of record, the Wherry amendment was never voted upon in the House. Before it could be voted upon, Representative CANNON made a motion to recede from the Senate amendment, and then offered his amendment to replace the Senate amendment. The vote was taken on the Cannon amendment to replace the Wherry amendment.

When the conference report came back to the Senate, action had to be taken on the Cannon amendment over the Wherry amendment approved by the Senate. It was at that time that I made the plea that my amendment had not been considered in conference and that therefore the bill should be sent back to conference. Before it could go to conference it had to go back to the House for a vote, under the House rules. So we again offered the amendment, with other amendments, as a substitute for the Cannon amendment. Then there was a motion by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to accept the Cannon amendment. The Cannon amendment is strictly a permissive piece of legislation. The provision should be mandatory, and not permissive.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct concerning the motion which I made. The Cannon amendment was the best we could get. The Senator from Nebraska was a member of the conference committee, as I was. I think the wording of the amendment he has offered is proper. The Senator from Nebraska will be on the next conference committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator. I was not quarreling at all with the fact that he made a motion to accept the Cannon amendment. That is all that was left to do.

There is no use talking about making it strong. Frankly I would like to make it strong, and I will go along with the Senator from Arizona. If we can make it any stronger, it is all right with me. However, when the amendment goes to conference this time, regardless of what the rules of the House may be, I hope the Senate conferees will remain steadfast and stand by what the Senate has done, even if it is necessary to have the House vote on it. I hope the conferees will act on the amendment. It is only in that way that we will get the kind of statute the Senator from Missouri is seeking. The provision must be made mandatory. It must be a mandatory prohibition against shipments of strategic materials to satellite countries and to Russia itself.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MALONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct to say that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska which came up when the Senate was sitting in the old Supreme Court room, was carried by a two-thirds vote?

Mr. WHERRY. By a very substantial vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was the overwhelming opinion of the Senate that the provision should be mandatory, and that was the way it should have been written.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his observation, because it makes it all the more obligatory upon the conferees on the pending bill, especially in view of the statement made by the chairman of the committee and by the Senator from Arizona, that we should insist upon the provisions of the amendment being mandatory and in that form embodied in the statute. We should never have conceded the point last year.

Apparently the Senate will vote on the amendment in a few moments. With the recommendation of the Senator in charge of the bill, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment unanimously. I hope further the conferees on the part of the Senate will insist, regardless of the rules of the House, that the amendment actually come before the full conference committee, and that when it comes back from conference it will not be a watered-down, permissive piece of legislation, but a mandatory provision carrying out the will of the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska if the Senate has not been fully informed, ever since the first proposal of the Marshall plan, that the trade treaties existed, beginning with only a few treaties and ending up with nearly 100, between Marshall-plan countries and Russia and iron-curtain countries.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I prepared an outline in chronological order of what has been attempted for several years in the way of enacting this kind of law. I have been greatly interested in the subject for many years. Because of the lateness of the hour, I did not call attention to the outline, which consists of two pages.

Mr. MALONE. It would be well to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. It consists of only notes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an outline, in chronological order, of the attempts we have made to bring up this type of legislation, and the action taken by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is a summary of action on the Wherry resolution to stop exportation of strategic war materials to Soviet Russia and her captive countries, including Communist China and North Korea:

1. H. R. 7786, section X–B (ECA): Amendment first introduced to ECA section of Omnibus Appropriations Bill. It excluded use of appropriated funds to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits to be exported any article or commodity usable by or which could be manufactured to be useful to the armed forces of the USSR and satellites. This is the form considered by many to be too broad and general. It was defeated in vote on Section X–B, July 31, 1950, by 33 to 39. (Reference: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 31, 1950, pp. 11513–11516.)

2. H. R. 8920, tax bill: Introduced amendment with same wording as that offered to H. R. 7786, August 30, 1950. Withdrew amendment September 1, 1950, with remarks that other sponsors desired to offer it in somewhat modified form as an amendment to S. 4037, internal security bill. (References: On introduction, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 30, pp. 14002–14008; on withdrawal, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 1, p. 14336.)

3. S. 4037 (H. R. 9490), internal-security bill (Note: There are two forms of the amendment, as offered to S. 4037): (a) Amendment, with wording considerably changed to put responsibility on Secretary of Defense was introduced, September 1, 1950. It was superseded by modified form. (b) Modified form of Wherry amendment was reintroduced on September 8, 1950. Modifications were worked out on suggestions by Senator MCCARRAN. The modified amendment was prevented from being brought up on a point of order raised by Senator ANDERSON. His contention was that the amendment was not germane to the internal security bill. (References: Speech by Senator WHERRY on purposes of amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 7, 1950, pp. 14484–14492; introduction of modified form of amendment to S. 4037, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 8, 1950, p. 14619; withdrawal on point of germaneness, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 12, 1950, pp. 14795–14801.)

4. H. R. 9526, supplemental appropriation bill, 1951: The remaining measure to which Senator WHERRY could attach his amendment, with any hope of passage, was H. R. 9526. In order to write legislation into an appropriation measure, he would have to give notice under rule XL that he intended to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill. Senator WHERRY's motion to suspend the rule would have to carry by a two-thirds vote of Members present and voting before a vote could be taken on his amendment.

(a) Notice of the motion to suspend and text of the amendment were offered on September 13, 1950. The wording of the amendment was the same as that offered, in the modified form, to S. 4037. On September 14, Senator WHERRY attempted to bring up his amendment "cold," on its merits. A long debate ensued. Senator LODGE offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, unacceptable to Senator WHERRY. Senator GEORGE made an impassioned plea for the Wherry amendment as against the Lodge proposal.

Senator WHERRY then asked that his amendment be set aside temporarily and his motion to suspend the rules be brought up in order to remove the hazards of rule XVI. The motion to suspend the rules to clear the way for action on the Wherry amendment passed on a vote of 50 to 23.

(b) Action on the Wherry amendment then followed. Senator CORDON offered a minor word amendment, which was accepted by Senator WHERRY, and the Wherry amendment (as modified), passed the Senate, without dissenting voice. (References: Introduction of motion to suspend and amendment to H. R. 9526, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 14859–14860, September 13, 1950; debate and vote on Wherry amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 14, 1950, pp. 15939–15954.)

There was no printing of Wherry amendment, as amended and passed by the Senate, except in printing of H. R. 9526, as it went to the House after conference. See copy attached, exhibit 4 (b).

5. Conference report on H. R. 9256: There was never a conference on the Wherry amendment. It could not be discussed by the conferees until the House could take separate action on it, under a rule similar to that in the Senate.

The conference report and the Wherry amendment were taken to the House for action on September 21, 1950. As a matter of record, the Wherry amendment was never voted upon in the House. Before it could be voted upon, Congressman CANNON introduced a motion to recede from the Senate amendment, and then offered his amendment to replace the Senate amendment. The vote was taken on the Cannon amendment to replace the Wherry amendment.

When the conference report came back to the Senate, action had to be taken on the Cannon amendment over the Wherry amendment approved by the Senate. Senator WHERRY made the plea that his amendment had not gone to conference and therefore the bill should be sent back to conference. He again offered his amendment, with still further amendments, as a substitute for the Cannon amendment. His substitute was defeated by a vote of 28 to 39, and the McKellar motion to accept the Cannon version of the Wherry amendment was accepted. (Reference: Debate on Wherry amendment and substitute, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 22, 1950, pp. 15723–15737.)

Mr. MALONE. Do I understand that the amendment which is now before the Senate, known as the Kem amendment, is practically the same as the so-called Wherry resolution?

Mr. KEM. It is identical.

Mr. WHERRY. It is identical. The resolution which I submitted was presented not only for myself, but on behalf of many other Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Including the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. The amendment is sponsored by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the junior Senator from Nevada, and it contains the same language which the minority leader had submitted in the form of a resolution, in which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the junior Senator from Nevada joined.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Also the Senator from Michigan and many other Senators.

Mr. MALONE. Is the amendment to be amended now?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has accepted the Kem amendment in toto. The remarks I made had to do with procedure in conference. I appreciated the remarks of the Senator from Michigan with reference to the vote. If we adopt the amendment unanimously at this time, I hope, regardless of the rules of the House that the amendment as adopted will be brought into conference, where it may be thrashed out. The Senate should stand fast on the mandatory provision.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska is aware, is he not, that exports from Singapore and Hong Kong of rubber, tin, steel, and practically all other materials which are necessary for war and for peace have been stepped up materially in the last 6 or 8 months, perhaps within the last few years.

Mr. WHERRY. The Cannon version on the subject does not go far enough. It is time for the Senate to take action.

I know that many speeches have been made and many recommendations have been forthcoming. The pending amendment would place the responsibility squarely where it belongs. It is a mandatory provision. I think it would go a long way toward eliminating the exports which we know are being made and which should be stopped.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the able chairman of the subcommittee has indicated his acceptance of the amendment, I shall not delay the Senate but I should like to ask that a statement which I prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

The Senate Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies has been studying the export controls and policies followed by the agencies of the United States Government in Western Germany and their relation to similar activities of the West German and other allied governments. It is evident that any appraisal of the effectiveness of controls on the export of strategic and critical materials from the United States to Communist areas would be incomplete unless seen in relation to the current activities of those now carried on in Western Europe.

The subcommittee has found a deplorable condition existing with regard to export controls and policies in Western Germany.

As important as Western Germany is in east-west trade, it is evident that a study of allied and West German controls and policies in that country covers only one part of the whole picture of east-west trade, which also involves other countries with whom we have a common security interest. Formal and informal avowals of that common interest have been expressed by participation in the Atlantic Pact, NATO, the European recovery program, and the various military- and economic-aid programs which have formed a major framework of United States foreign policy since World War II.

The investigations of the subcommittee last winter in the United States alone, with respect to exports of strategic and critical materials to Communist China, an aggressor nation which is at this very moment engaged in killing United States and other troop contingents of the United Nations, revealed that even agencies of our own Government were delinquent and tardy in initiating measures to protect our national security.

The recent investigation of Western Germany has shown this to be the case there also. Strategic shipments by one of our major allies, Great Britain, to the Communist enemy, as disclosed recently in the British Parliament, have pointed up the extreme state of confusion, disagreement, and business-as-usual attitudes of large segments of the anti-Communist Western World with regard to east-west trade.

It is true that efforts have been made not only by United States agencies, but also by governments of western Europe and the United Nations to decrease, hinder, and halt the flow of war-potential materials to the eastern bloc. There is very little question, though, that these efforts have been neither adequate nor timely nor wholehearted in terms of the enormous danger that faces the Western World at present.

The question which faces us today is whether what we have done and are doing is too little and too late in countering this situation which now menaces the very freedom of Western Europe and the United States.

Discussions of measures for safeguarding our common security interests in the matter of east-west trade have been marked by quibbling, procrastination, and reluctant acquiescence in those things which are for the national and international good.

Prime Minister Attlee, in a recent statement in the British House of Commons, stated: "There is no agreement as to what is strategic." This statement is an evasive truism which has little value toward achieving effective action to halt the flow of war materials to those who seek to subjugate the free world.

Cerainly there can be but a small area of disagreement as to what are strategic materials. We have tangible and definite indications in current world-wide shortages, in a review of the items which we supplied Russia in the war against Nazi Germany, and in the very extensive supplies which are being furnished at present to the North Atlantic Pact countries and, even more, in a review of those things the east is now trying hardest to obtain.

The small real area of disagreement as to which items in international trade may be strategic should be no obstacle to agreement between countries which having just fought one costly war are now engaged in further hostilities which threaten once more to involve the whole world. We already know what mobilization of resources we are requiring now in our own defense effort and in the struggle against the aggressor nations in the Far East. It is incomprehensible, then, why any western nation whose very future is jeopardized should sit back and insist upon the shipment of goods to the east on the theory that the quantity shipped is not strategic.

Defense and security interests cannot be limited to the lowest common denominator of national self-interest, nor can it be geared to the progress made by the least cooperative and least willing country in the community of western nations in limiting exports to the east of restricted material. And yet, what is the record of international cooperation in this very important context of western defense? Let us cite a few examples of international inactivity in achieving common measures of export controls.

Transit trade, shipment of goods to a friendly country whence it is transshiped to the enemy, is acknowledged as a major loophole for strategic shipments to the East, is exceeded perhaps only by direct shipments from noncooperating countries. Such trade is still uncontrolled by anything approaching a multilateral agreement of the western countries. Throughout Europe the traditional free ports are operating without any hindrance as a major channel for strategic supplies to the east.

What about West Europe's export controls? In an effort to ascertain if strategic goods are being reexported or transshipped to the eastern bloc, this country has found it necessary to check the end-use of each shipment of strategic materials to Western European nations. Let me point out, though, that this procedure is being followed not with regard to potentially unfriendly countries, but is directed toward our allies in Western Europe receiving materials, through grants, loans, and outright gifts, from the United States for their armies, their industries, and their citizens. Many of these goods are in short supply here and are needed for our own economy, but we are sharing them in the interests of western defense. Why has it been necessary to institute such checks of our friends and allies? Is it simply that there is no agreement as to what is strategic? Or is it that Western European countries do not have the will or desire to carry out steps necessary to the common defense which may be somewhat onerous to their citizens or disagreeable to their politicians or costly of trade profits.

Why has the United States stood almost alone in denouncing and prosecuting those of its own citizens who have attempted to export illegally to the eastern bloc when practically no other Western European country has done so on any comparable scale? Why is it, indeed, that trade of the western nations with the eastern bloc has increased enormously in terms of machinery and industrial goods and raw materials at a time when less total goods than ever are being offered by Eastern European countries? Much that is offered by the east is not essential to the Western European economics, and the balance there is not sufficient quantity or value to warrant the trade.

The statement made just today in the House of Commons that, in the interest of better relations between Great Britain and the United States, no more rubber would be shipped to Red China for the remainder of this year is a welcome one, even though it comes late, indeed. Maybe by the end of the year it may be possible to convince the British authorities that this ban on shipments of rubber which have contributed so vastly to the war potential of our common foe, should be continued indefinitely. This we must try to do.

It is true that in the period 1947 through 1949 some of the trade with the east was vital to the rehabilitation and supply of the Western European community. There were many items which could not be supplied from the United States if at all, as cheaply and as quickly as from the east. The Western European picture, however, has changed. The trade balance no longer favors the east. Although Western European countries still rely on eastern sources for many supplies, nowhere is there now the former urgency to obtain them from that market. Nor is the exchange in terms of hard goods or essentials in favor of the western countries. Western Europeans face a Communist trade bloc whose very motive is to play one country against another to drain from the west those goods with which a war potential of frightening proportions is being built.

It is time to face these facts squarely and with the hard headed realism which is required to match the ruthless cunning of those who would use our very inactivity and short sighted disagreements for their profit and our eventual destruction. The Western World must adopt and effectively enforce a collective system of dealing with the east which will not only put trade on a quid pro quo basis, but will assure that such trade will take place only when a strategic advantage inures to the west. The United States must provide leadership and receive cooperation from Western Europe in meeting the common peril which is implicit in east-west trade, to the end that no soldier of the United States or of any other of the United Nations serving in the cause of freedom will die of a bullet inscribed in the west and shipped through the courtesy of confusion, laxity, and irresolution.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it would be highly desirable for the Senate to give backing to the assertions and observations which have been made this afternoon. The Senator from Arizona has indicated his wholehearted approval of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who have been consistently in favor of such a provision.

I should like to make one comment with reference to a statement made this afternoon by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], which I appreciate, of course, because he referred to the senior Senator from Maryland. Today in the House of Commons, as the Senator from

Nevada has stated, it was asserted that representatives of Great Britain have indicated their willingness to suspend shipments from Hong Kong, but they attach to their willingness the condition "for the remainder of the year," and only in respect to certain categories of shipments.

We have found that since last June, or since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, there have been exported some $357,000,000 worth of strategic supplies; from Great Britain, $11,200,000; from Hong Kong, $288,400,000; from Malaya, $56,000,000.

My only reason for emphasizing the point, and hoping that the Senate conferees will stand firm, is that we have recently received further disquieting information concerning the export policies having to do with east-west trade in Europe. It shows a disgraceful situation. The Senator from Arizona very accurately has stated that we placed controls on shipments, an all-out embargo, as of last December. I regret to say that prior to that time, when we were alleging that shipments were going forward, our own officials were making statements that no strategic supplies were being sent behind the iron curtain.

The Senator from Arizona has confirmed the fact that during the months of September, October, and November, when our boys were fighting in Korea, these shipments were being made, although our own officials were denying that that was so. I agree entirely with what has been said by other Senators, and only hope that by a show of unanimity on this floor we can indicate to the conferees that we intend to have them take action which will put a stop to this thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that the hour is late, but I ask the Senator whether or not it is true that, while the Congress has been endeavoring to accomplish the result of stopping such trade not only between the United States and countries behind the iron curtain, but also between other nations who are our allies and Communist countries, yet the trade has been continuing and is actually helping the Soviet and its satellites in their war effort? Although we have endeavored to enact legislation prohibiting the traffic, we have not accomplished anything. Has not the time come when we must accomplish this result by mandatory legislation so far as our own country is concerned, and so far as aid to our allies is concerned?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think that is unquestionably true. I do not believe that in any other way will it be effective in regard to our attempts to have our so-called allies join with us.

Mr. FERGUSON. The situation becomes really ridiculous when we trade with our enemies. Does not the Senator feel that the time has come to act in this matter if we do not want to have the blood of our boys on our hands?

Mr. O'CONOR. I agree entirely with the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland if he does not believe that it is a disgraceful situation in the first place, when it is necessary for the Congress of the United States to enact a firm law to keep our Cabinet officers from assisting our enemies, with whom we are now at war, and to prevent our enemies from receiving materials which are war materials? Everything is war material when we are at war.

Mr. O'CONOR. I can best answer the Senator by saying that I think it is disgraceful for anyone to give assistance to our enemies. Actually this country has been giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and our allies have been doing likewise, because they have drawn very false distinctions as to what is strategic. Under that theory they have been allowing very useful materials to go behind the iron curtain because they contend that there is some doubt as to what is strategic, when there can be no question about the nature of the goods which, until the past week, they have been sending.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate on March 4 and 5, 1948, before the initial Marshall plan was passed, and inserted in the RECORD a firm trade treaty which had been made between England and Russia. The first item in the treaty was 1,100 locomotives. The list of materials comprised dozens of articles, including tool steel, electrical equipment, all kinds of construction equipment, and everything else needed to fight a war or to live in peace, everything needed to consolidate gains made in Eastern Europe. If this material could not have been furnished in the way it was, Russia and her satellites might have had to turn to other nations and change their tune and their allegiance.

Does the Senator agree with me that a large amount of the material which Communist China—of course, assisted by Communist Russia, without a doubt—is using to kill our boys in Korea was furnished and paid for by the taxpayers of America, who are the fathers of the boys being killed?

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course, I am unable to say that the identical material which has been used in killing our soldiers is traceable to a certain spot, but I think I can answer the Senator's question by saying that wholesale quantities of strategic useful war materials have gone from this country since last June, and from our allies up until very recently. It has served to build up the industrial and military potential of the Communist countries.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that for the past 4 years the State Department has continually allowed statements to leak, or has made them directly from the State Department and other departments, to the effect that in order to obtain manganese and other strategic materials from Russia we must sell the kind of material which she needs and is unable to manufacture?

Mr. O'CONOR. I cannot confirm the statement.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator remember the press dispatches?

Mr. O'CONOR. I know what the Senator is referring to, and I recall the statements which he placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. We now have the spectacle of India asking for 2,000,000 tons of wheat, or some other fantastic amount. She has many things which we could use, in the way of strategic and critical minerals and materials, such as hemp, manganese, and various other materials. She has placed an embargo or a limit upon the amount of manganese which can be shipped to this country.

The junior Senator from Nevada knows from personal study that there is more manganese in India than both India and the United States could use in the next 50 years. There is probably more manganese in South Africa than South Africa and the United States could use in 50 years; and probably more in Brazil than both the United States and Brazil could use in that length of time. Does it not add up to the fact that what our State Department has been trying to do is to convince itself, and then convince the country, that it was necessary to send certain materials to Russia and to other Communist countries in order to obtain the materials which we needed?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am thankful to the Senator for his observation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for himself and other Senators. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, was there a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri? I could not hear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was agreed to without objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has on the desk an amendment to the bill in relation to the salaries and expenses of the minority and majority policy committees. At this time he is not going to offer the amendment. The period remaining for the use of this fund is only about a month and a half. It would probably be impossible at this late date, to obtain such research personnel as would be required. The Senator from Michigan is withholding his amendment because of the persuasion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is the chairman of the subcommittee on legislative salaries and legislative aides. I know that he intends to make a thorough study and examination of the entire program, and that this is a matter which can be considered by the com-

mittee in connection with the regular 1952 appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I intend to go into that subject very thoroughly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will not offer the amendment, although the subject is very important. The policy committees perform a very important and valuable function in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 3587) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, be ordered to be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEY EMPLOYED BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who desires to take up on Monday the motion to reconsider Senate Joint Resolution 70 to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. No action should be taken on it today, but in order that it may be the unfinished business, so that it will be taken up on Monday, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider the motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 70 was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to proceed to the motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO PERSONS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the presiding officer be authorized to sign Senate Joint Resolution 72, to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is that the joint resolution which was passed by the Senate this afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN PRICE OF CHILEAN COPPER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada would like to call to the attention of the Senate the action of the State Department in agreeing, with what he would call indecent haste, to a 3-cent increase in the price of copper from Chile, which brings the price of Chilean copper to 28 cents per pound. This action was taken after the passage of the Free Trade Act on copper. The proponents of the bill to suspend the import taxes on copper agreed that its passage was necessary to enable the United States to get more copper from foreign sources, Chile particularly, and that the knocking down of the tariff would make more copper available.

Mr. President, I wish to read an excerpt from an article published in the Journal of Commerce on May 8, the day the increase in the Chilean copper price was agreed to. The article which is dated Washington, May 7, being a dispatch from the Washington Bureau, is as follows:

> The United States has agreed to a 3-cent increase in the price of Chilean copper, the State Department announced today.
>
> In reporting on talks carried on between the United States and Chilean Governments on copper problems, the State Department also disclosed that this country has agreed to steps designed to increase copper production in the South American country.
>
> Chile, on the other hand, has agreed to make more copper available for United States defense purposes, and to take steps to keep its copper out of the hands of countries in the Soviet bloc.

There was a blackmailed threat of selling copper to other countries in the Soviet bloc if we did not agree to the free trade on copper.

I read further:

> American copper companies with interests in Chile will expand their production without financial assistance from the United States Government but with the promise of priority assistance for equipment.

THE ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT MAKE SENSE

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada calls that indecent haste. The State Department should at least have waited a decent length of time until we could forget the reasons for suspending the duty on copper. This latest action leaves the independent producers of copper in the United States with a controlled copper price of 24 cents, with the 2 cent tariff reimposed when the price goes below 24 cents.

At the Geneva Conference, that gave birth to the GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—the State Department reduced the import tax on copper from 4 cents per pound to 2 cents per pound. A little later it then persuaded the Congress to supend even that duty, under various kinds of excuses. The question of the tax on copper belonged in the realm of foreign policy, and our relations with Chile would be injured. Lately the excuse was that it would bring more copper into this country.

Now, on top of all that, the State Department agrees to a higher price on copper from Chile.

As I have said before, Mr. President, in this connection it does not hurt the companies that own the properties in South America, in Chile, but it is a little embarrassing to the small copper producer, or the prospector, or investor who has some idea of finding or developing a new copper deposit, because private money will not be invested in his enterprise.

Mr. President, in the House Report No. 285 to accompany House bill 3336, made by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, the bill dealing with the copper import-tax suspension, we find the following on page 2:

> Despite the unanimous assurances of all the departments and agencies of the Government that suspension of the import tax on copper under present and foreseeable conditions could not adversely affect domestic producers of copper, the bill contains its own assurance in the interest of the domestic copper-mining industry by providing for revocation of the suspension whenever the price of copper falls below the price of 24 cents per pound. Accordingly, the committee is unanimous in recommending prompt enactment of the bill.

TARIFF REIMPOSITION UNREALISTIC

Mr. President, that shows just the kind of reasonsing that has been used frequently in relation to the production of many war materials in this country. In this case, a price was grabbed out of thin air, as the junior Senator from Nevada explained when the bill was being discussed on the Senate floor; the arbitrary price of 24 cents was grabbed out of thin air as the point below which the tariff would be reimposed. This figure has no relation whatever to a fair and reasonably competitive price for foreign copper as compared with domestic copper.

On April 25, 1951, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 449, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio called to the attention of the junior Senator from Nevada the following:

> Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the State Department is discussing paying to Chile 28 cents a pound for all the copper Chile produces, as compared to the 24 cents a pound which is paid to American producers?

The junior Senator from Nevada answered:

> Mr. MALONE. Yes; I learned this morning that the State Department is intending to raise the price of Chilean copper. However, that is not a precedent, for in the past 18 years not a single instance in which a domestic producer got a break has come to my attention.
>
> In other words, the State Department intends to pay more for foreign copper and for foreign zinc and for foreign lead and for foreign tungsten and for every other metal produced in a foreign country, than is paid to the domestic producers of those metals.

I quote further from the RECORD of that date, April 25. The junior Senator from Nevada said:

As the distinguished Senator from Ohio said a few moments ago, it has already been agreed—I repeat, it has already been agreed—that more will be paid to Chile for copper than the price which has been fixed in the pending bill for domestic copper.

Mr. President, quoting further from that RECORD, I said:

Mr. President, I want to make brief mention of something which has been going on throughout the country. Resolutions of mining organizations have been adopted. Most of them are set up for the particular purpose of protecting large producers. Many of these mining organizations have adopted resolutions favoring free trade on copper.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has a resolution favoring free trade.

Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States favors free trade in general, not merely in regard to copper. Copper is merely a symbol in this fight for free trade which we are discussing.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT TO BE EXTENDED

I understand that on Monday the Senate will take up the bill, H. R. 1612, to extend for two more years the authority of the thoroughly discredited Secretary of State to have complete control over industry and the workingmen of our Nation. This bill was reported unanimously by the Finance Committee. Under that bill, if it is enacted, there can be another Torquay conference; and if the job of creating free trade has not already been completed—although we believe it has—it can be completed then.

Mr. President, numerous mining organzations have gone on record by way of resolution in regard to this matter. For instance, the Nevada Mine Operators' Association, meeting at Reno, Nev., on February 23, 1951, adopted a resolution from which I now read:

Whereas it is obvious that the present duty on copper is nothing more than a hindrance to obtaining this very necessary and urgently needed metal from accessible foreign sources, such as the copper mines of South America which are owned and operated by citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That for national defense and for preservation of the domestic copper mining industry, Nevada Mine Operators' Association, representing copper producers of this State, earnestly urges that the present tariff duty be suspended for the emergency, and, to that end, it endorses and recommends passage of pending legislation suspending that duty.

COPPER TAX SUSPENSION MEANS LOSS OF TAXPAYER'S MONEY AS WELL AS OF INVESTMENTS

Mr. President, all that suspension of the tariff on copper will do will be to put out of business, probably permanently, any independent domestic copper producer, unless he can receive from the Government of the United States, in payments from the Treasury—which many of them have been able to do—some of the taxpayers' money, with the result that at the end of the emergency the taxpayers' money will be lost. That procedure has made it impossible for not only the copper industry, but also the textile industry, the chinaware and pottery industry and many other industries to obtain private investment funds for their expansion.

Mr. President, the Butte Miners Union in a resolution on this subject has made the following declaration:

Resolved, That the Butte Miners Union declares its support of legislation now before Congress the purpose and intent of which is to suspend the duty on import of copper for the duration of the national emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MURRAY and ECTON and to Congressmen MANSFIELD and D'EWART.

The international executive board of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers has issued a statement in regard to the layoffs in the brass industry. That statement appears by way of a long resolution on that subject. I read a part of the resolution:

3. During such time as copper remains in acute short supply in this country no useful purpose is served by the present duty on imported copper and it should be temporarily susended.

* * * * *

A government which is only too anxious to provide billions to industry in rebates, subsidies, loans, and other considerations should assume some responsibility for the very existence of thousands of its citizens who are the needless victims of Government policies.

WE ALL WANT FREE TRADE ON WHAT WE BUY, TARIFFS ON WHAT WE SELL

I thoroughly agree with that statement; but I wish to call to the attention of the President of the Senate the fact that the products manufactured by the brass industry have an ad valorem tariff of anywhere from 15 to 65 percent.

The copper fabricating industry cannot live 60 days without those tariffs. I approve of a tariff on those products. Copper constitute sabout 60 to 80 percent of the raw materials used by the fabricating industry; so the mining organizations have adopted numerous resolutions similar to the one adopted by the Colorado Mining Association, which includes the following statement:

In view of the fact that copper must be had if we are to maintain our standard of living and prepare for the momentous tasks ahead, we must secure all the copper possible both from domestic and foreign sources.

Mr. President, if there were free trade on fabricated copper products, just as there is free trade on copper, it would be impossible to get private capital to invest in that industry.

LARGE COMPANIES CONTROL COPPER INDUSTRY

By the way, Mr. President, 75 to 80 percent of the production in the brass industry is owned or controlled by the large companies, all of whom backed the legislation suspending the copper tariffs. However, let me state what the effect of this legislation, if enacted, will be: If the tariff is removed from copper—private investment will shy away from the domestic copper industry.

COPPER ONLY A SYMBOL

And copper is only a symbol in this fight involving 500 to 1,000 other products, such as textiles, precision instruments, chinaware, machinery and steel products of all kinds and many, many other products.

The minute we tamper with the tariffs on those products we scare away any private investment money which might otherwise be invested in those industries. Thereby, in the case of copper we destroy for at least the length of the duration of the emergency, and for as long as Congress continues to nibble at the tariff, any possibility of having private money used in looking for new deposits of copper.

MANY DEPOSITS OF COPPER ARE WAITING TO BE WORKED

By the way, Mr. President, let me state that in 11 Western States alone there are approximately 469 known copper deposits. Some of them have been worked, but most of them have not been.

Mr. President, I now read briefly from a statement made by the Senator from Georgia to the Senate when he reported out the bill to suspend the import tax on copper:

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. Two amendments were made to the bill, one of which was an amendment offered in committee by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], relative to the expiration of the act, which amendment was accepted by the conferees.

Mr. President, that amendment provided for the suspension to be lifted by February 1953, or the expiration of the emergency, whichever came earlier.

The copper-tax suspension bill itself on its face is a farce and a subterfuge, Mr. President, just as is the bill which will extend for two more years the authority of the Secretary of State over all industry and all the workingmen of America, the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which will come before the Senate next Monday.

Mr. President, this copper bill is essentially no different from the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, except that it creates free trade for one product separately. I am opposed to the spirit of either one, and I warn the Senate that it is foolish and dangerous to make two separate issues of these two bills.

THE TREASURY SUPPORTS OUR ECONOMY

Mr. President, as I have said on numerous occasions, these tariff reductions are made under cover of war, under the authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, just as the war was supposedly the reason for suspending the copper tax. And we are in a war, regardless of what the President says about "a police action" and regardless of the fact that the veterans of the war in Korea are being turned down by Veterans' Administration hospitals because the Korean War is called a police action. Regardless of all those legal shenanigans, Mr. President, this is a war, and we are financing our industries out of the Treasury of the United States. That is the only way we can exist now, for with our present economic structure, we cannot live in time of peace.

THE KOREAN WAR CURED UNEMPLOYMENT

All of us say we want peace; but the minute we have peace, the entire economic structure of our country will crumble, just as it was starting to crum-

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 54 of May 10, being a quorum call, I am listed as not being present. I was present on that occasion and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, THOMAS, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address recently made by President Truman.

The address referred to follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TO INDUSTRY ADVISORY GROUP

Thank you very much. My first visit to this auditorium, Mr. Secretary, was on a Meet-the-Press Program, when I was a United States Senator, making some investigations in the Second World War. It was not a very satisfactory meeting for me. I hope this one will be more satisfactory to you. It came out all right, though. They got me into more trouble than any man has ever gotten into in the history of the world.

Mr. Secretary and gentlemen of the conference, I am glad to meet with you gentlemen here today.

I know that you are all ready to do everything you can to help out in this time of emergency—and I want to emphasize that statement, the country never has been in a greater emergency—and I know you will do a good job. You have a fine man to work with in Oscar Chapman. He is thoroughly familiar with the natural resources you gentlemen are here to advise us about, and we could not have a better man in charge of the mobilization of those resources for the defense effort.

Now, I want to say to you that every man that I have asked to help in this project has been a man of ability and patriotism, and don't let anybody tell you anything else.

I appreciate very much the fact that you are willing to come and help us with our mobilization problems. It shows that when our country has a big job to do people are ready to pitch in and help. And let me tell you now our country does have a big job to do—just about the biggest and the hardest job in history.

WARNS AGAINST RELAXING

One of the worst difficulties we have to overcome is the feeling that we can relax because we are not in an all-out war. That is a terrible mistake. We can not afford to relax. We have three enemies to overcome, one abroad and two at home.

Aggression is the first one. We are shooting that one out in Korea, as we did in Greece and Berlin and other places.

No. 2 is inflation. That is a home product we are taxing and by controls curing inflation—we hope.

No. 3 is the worst of all, and that is relaxation. You can't cure the tendency to relax every time there is a lull in the hostilities.

The Secretary of the Treasury was talking to me at the Cabinet meeting recently, in which he said that every time it looks as if we are winning, either the fight against inflation or the fight against aggression, you can see the country relax as the crises, and securities and things of that kind go up and down. You must meet this situation head-on. And the thing that you gentlemen can do is to overcome the worst of our three enecies—relaxation.

Our mobilization problem is different in some ways from what it was in World War II, but it is just as urgent, and just as important to our national survival.

Today, the danger is world-wide, but the actual fighting is limited to a small area, where we are trying to keep it. We are trying to keep the conflict limited, and to bring it to a victorious end, just as rapidly as possible.

STRENGTH MUST INCREASE

But peace in Korea will not put an end to the global danger of Soviet aggression. We must build up enough military strength—enough military strength actually in existence—to convince the Kremlin that it ought not to start a world war.

We must prepare ourselves to mobilize quickly for war in case the Kremlin is reckless enough in spite of everything, to plunge the world into a general conflict.

Our defense experts—both military and civilian—have developed a definite, concrete plan to do these two things. This plan provides for bigger active armed forces, and lays the foundation for complete mobilization, if that should become necessary. We must carry out that plan as rapidly as we possibly can. We want to reach our goal just as fast as the men can be trained, the plants built, and the equipment and supplies turned out.

During the next couple of years, while we are building up this military strength, we shall be diverting materials, converting plants, and disrupting normal life for businessmen and consumers. It will not be as drastic as a shake-up as if we were in a global war, but whatever the situation calls for must be done. Our continued existence as a nation may depend on how well we carry out this program.

In the next year or two, the military-production program is going to require extensive use of production controls and a good strong anti-inflation program. So far, we have only begun to feel the effect of military demands on our supplies of raw materials, manpower, and plant capacity. But we are going to feel this effect severely in the months to come. The largest part of the problem is still ahead of us. Now, I want to emphasize this: the largest part of the problem is still ahead of us.

AMOUNT OF ORDERS PLACED

Since last June, about $26,000,000,000 worth of orders have been placed for military equipment and construction. Only a small part of that has been delivered as yet.

Moreover, we still have about $58,000,000,000 worth of orders to place, in the next 14 months, under our present military plans.

You can easily see, therefore, that the demands of military production on materials and manpower will be going up month by month for a long time. That is why it is urgently necessary that the Congress continue for 2 years more the production controls authorized by the Defense Production Act.

It is also urgently necessary for the Congress to extend the authority for inflation controls—controls on prices, wages and credit, and rents. And by that I mean adequate authority to do the job—authority not crippled by a lot of special exemptions for special groups. This is absolutely vital for the future of this great Nation of ours.

Most of you are businessmen, who understand the terrible effects that the inflationary spiral could have on our economy if it is not kept in check. Now you have got a leading businessman in control of that very thing. You know how extremely important it is to hit inflation and hit it hard. To do that, we will have to use price and wage controls for the next 2 or 3 years at least.

There are some people who think we can now abandon price and wage controls and still stop inflation. They say that heavy taxes and other so-called indirect controls can do the whole job from here on. But as bigger and bigger military orders hit our economy, that will be clearly impossible.

HEAVY TAXES NEEDED

Of course, heavy taxes are needed, and I'm doing my best to get the Congress to enact enough taxes to keep the budget in balance. I would be delighted if each one of you would urge your Congressman and Senators to raise taxes.. I am serious about this; I think you ought to be asking the Congress for higher taxes.

But when you do that, be sure to urge them to extend price and wage controls, too. It all goes together, if we are going to meet this situation.

The plain fact is that when you expand production, as we are doing now in this country, people have more money to spend. And when that expanded production goes into military goods, there aren't enough civilian goods for people to spend the extra money on. This creates an inflationary gap. That is what is going to happen over the next year or two. There is no escaping it. It is going to get worse before it gets better. And those who are spreading the foolish notion that we can get through this period without price and wage controls are doing the country an immense amount of harm.

We hope that this period will not be long and that the time will come in 2 or 3 years when we can begin to take controls off. We are moving as rapidly as we can to expand the productive capacity of the country. Assuming that the Kremlin does not bring on a world war, we hope that our productive capacity will soon be great enough so that we can carry the defense program and still produce an ample supply of civilian goods. When that time comes, we should be able to do without controls.

If we are to bring that about, you gentlemen here must help us. You are particularly concerned with producing various types of raw materials and minerals, fuel and power. Increased capacity to produce these vital materials is basic not only to our defense, but to the kind of economy we want to have in the future.

I see no limit to the economic future of this country. I have said that time and again and have been called a dreamer and a visionary for doing it, but it is coming about.

RATE OF PRODUCTION

In the first half of this year, we are producing goods and services at an estimated annual rate of about $307,000,000,000. This is about the same allowing for price changes, as the annual rate achieved in 1944—the peak production year of World War II. The present rate is almost $40,000,000,000 higher than what we did in 1948. But we have not yet reached the ceiling. We have the resources and the technology to grow by about 5 percent a year over the next few years, in about 3 years this would lift our output to about $350,000,000,000, measured in present prices. And we can go far beyond that.

That is the sort of picture I ask you gentlemen to keep before you during this emergency period. The world is in a dangerous condition, but we know what we must do about it. It will take patience and determination. It will take good solid American patriotism—the kind that puts the national interest ahead of the selfish interest.

The people of the United States, together with the people of the other free countries, can win a victory in the struggle with Soviet communism. I'm just as sure of that as I'm sure I am standing here.

What it will take is hard work by everybody in the country, willingness by everybody to carry his fair share of the load.

That is what we are asking of you gentlemen here. And I am very sure that you are going to do your part.

Thank you very much.

ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which has read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the eleventh report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as amended, as well as the programs of economic aid to China and the general area of China under the China Area Aid Act (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 430, 447, and 535, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended December 31, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 10, 1951.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3297, a bill to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike out all after "greater" over to and including "amended" in line 5 on page 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, by striking out this amendment just how does it affect the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. It strikes out reference to civil-service retirement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think perhaps that is the amendment I objected to when we had it before our committee. It does give them an opportunity to serve on the civil defense set-up that is supposed to be operating in the District. We are getting a good many critical letters from people relative to the state of the defense in the District of Columbia. Whether it is good or bad, it does give the members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Metropolitan Fire Department an opportunity to serve in this capacity. I see no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill [H. R. 3957] to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 691 of the act of March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 26–404), is hereby amended—

(1) By striking out "the Comptroller of the Currency, in addition to the powers conferred upon him by law for the examination of national banks, is further authorized, whenever he may deem it useful," and by inserting in lieu thereof "the Home Loan Bank Board is authorized, whenever such Board may deem it useful";

(2) By striking out "not exceed the sum of $25 for the first $500,000 or fractional part thereof of assets and the sum of $10 for each additional $250,000 or fractional part thereof of assets, and";

(3) By striking out "The said comptroller shall also have power to take possession of any company or association whenever in his judgment it is insolvent or is knowingly violating the laws under which such company is incorporated, and to liquidate the same in the manner provided in the laws of the United States in respect to national banks:", and by inserting in lieu thereof "The Home Loan Bank Board shall also have power to take possession of any company or association whenever in the Board's judgment any such company or association is insolvent or is knowingly violating the laws under which it is operated and to liquidate the same in the manner provided in rules and regulations which said Board is hereby authorized to adopt, and said Board may also provide in such rules and regulations a procedure for the voluntary liquidation of any such company or association; and if any such company or association which has not gone into liquidation and for which a receiver has not already been appointed for other lawful cause shall discontinue its operations for a period of 60 days, the Home Loan Bank Board may, if such Board deems it advisable, appoint a received for such company or association:";

(4) By striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" wherever appearing in such section and by inserting in lieu thereof "Home Loan Bank Board"; and

(5) By striking out the word "him" from the second sentence of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "such Board."

SEC. 2. Section 691a of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 26–405) is hereby amended—

(1) By striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" wherever appearing in such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof "Home Loan Bank Board";

(2) By striking out "he" and "his" wherever appearing in paragraph (e) of such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof "such Board" and "such Board's", respectively; and

(3) By striking out in paragraph (g) of such section "if said examinaiton is made beyond the limits of the District of Columbia, but if made within the limits of the District of Columbia, the cost of the examination to be at the same rate and upon the same terms as provided in section 691."

SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of the act of April 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 500), as amended by the act of March 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1564; D. C. Code, sec. 26–103 (c)), is hereby amended by striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" wherever appearing in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "Home Loan Bank Board," and by adding after the phrase "to maintain any office or place of business in the District of Columbia," the "following: "Other than a foreign association which qualifies for a certificate of authority under section 691a of the act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 26–405)."

SEC. 4. Any powers, duties, and functions of the Comptroller of the Currency with respect to building associations and building and loan associations operating in the District of Columbia which are not transferred to the Home Loan Bank Board by the specific statutory amendments herein contained are also hereby transferred from the Comptroller of the Currency to the Home Loan Bank Board.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to transfer certain functions relating to building associations organized or doing business in the District of Columbia from the Comptroller of the Currency to the Home Loan Bank Board.

thereby preventing foreign nations from obtaining benefits from the United States without giving any concession in return.

AMENDMENT No. 10

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. (a) The third sentence of subsection (a) (2) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the most-favored-nation clause), is amended by striking out 'of all foreign countries,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'only of those foreign countries which are parties to the particular agreements requiring or making appropriate such proclaimed duties and restrictions and shall so apply to such articles.'

"(b) This section shall take effect 90 days after enactment of this act."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment withdraws tariff concessions or other benefits given under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on agricultural commodities for which a subsidy or price-support program is in operation.

AMENDMENT No. 11

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. No foreign-trade agreement shall hereafter be negotiated or entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to any article unless the principal supplier of such article is a party to such negotiations and to such agreement. The principal supplier of any article shall be the country growing, producing, or manufacturing the largest quantity of such article imported into the United States for consumption during the three calendar years ending last prior to the beginning of such negotiations."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes mandatory the use of the principal supplier rule, thereby forcing the Executive to make reductions in duties on certain commodities only with those nations which are the principal beneficiaries under such reduction.

AMENDMENT No. 12

Beginning on page 1, with line 5, strike out through line 24 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession required or made appropriate by any foreign-trade agreement entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, after enactment of this act, shall be proclaimed or permitted to continue in effect after the enactment of this act."

On page 8, line 9, strike out "hereafter."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment prohibits the making of further trade agreements, but retains all the present features of H. R. 1612 which pertain to trade agreements already in effect.

THE FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the substitute offered under amendment No. 1 would establish, through congressional action, of the fair and reasonable competition principle a foreign-trade authority to adjust tariffs and import fees in the same manner that Congress long ago established the reasonable return on the investment principle in the fixing of freight rates, to be administered by an independent commission named the Interstate Commerce Commission.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 1149

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate bill 271, to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, passed the Senate some time ago and has been approved by the President. A similar bill, House bill 1149, was received from the House, having passed the House, and was ordered to lie on the table in the Senate. In view of the approval of the Senate bill, the House bill, without objection, will be indefinitely postponed.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 21, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1951:

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Robert P. Fasulo (naval academy) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Midshipman Richard L. Anderton (naval academy) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy:

John R. Arnold	Roger J. Lahn
Clifford S. Babcock	Robert G. Landon
Walter L. Briant	Arthur R. Loomer
Bradford N. Bunnell	David I. McGinnis
Burford A. Carlson	Vincent J. Madden
William F. Dudek	Richard B. Oldenburg
Owen W. Dykema	Royc C. Pichler
William H. Finn	Francis L. Ready
Richard T. Fling	Harry A. Saunders
Robert W. Gillespie	Robert DeL. Schbert
Monroe C. Gollaher	Douglas J. Smith
Douglas C. Gregory	William R. Sonnemann
John G. Guffner	Howard C. Springer
Richard B. Hansen	David W. Tompkins
Lawrence C. Hartley	George C. Schitzer
Henry F. Herbig	John R. Shaughnessy
Hugh P. Janes	
Carl W. Koch	

Ronald D. Hartell (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name

Byron S. Hollingshead, Jr. (naval ROTC) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Carl E. Wilbur

LIEUTENANT

John B. Riggsbee

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Howard Adler	James E. Odell
Robert W. Gibson	Nahum R. Shulman

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

LIEUTENANTS

Charles W. Fain, Jr.
Paul M. Leyden

Walter N. Johnson (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Thomas G. Akers	James P. Milano
James H. Berrian	Thomas G. Mitchell
Joseph C. Boudreaux, Jr.	Richard L. Sedam
	Joseph M. Tyler, Jr.
Richard M. Cox	Harry L. Wise
Daniel M. Goodacre III	

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Hilda Evans	Patricia A. Miller
Dorothy M. Hanson	Barbara Norris
Rebecca H. Jackson	Anna E. Venishnick
Patricia H. MacDonald	Clara P. Wienczek

POSTMASTER

The following-named person to be postmaster:

Rose A. Hancher to be postmaster at Elwood, Ind., in place of J. P. Mack, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Excutive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1951:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

James N. Jensen	Robert B. Black
Joseph N. Gonyeau	William G. Roden
Walter C. Schafran	Sidney F. Hansen

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert L. Smith	Frederick W. Folger
Walter Folger	John V. Caffrey
Frederick O. Wooley	Hollis M. Walker, Jr.
Thomas Osman, Jr.	Henry E. Engelbrecht
Lyle W. Lemos	

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray that Thou wilt strengthen and encourage our minds and hearts during this day with a reassuring sense of the reality of Thy greatness and goodness.

Forgive us for allowing ourselves at times to be so faithless and to feel that the noble ideals and principles, which we cherish, have lost their luster and will never be victorious.

Send us forth with new faith and hope as we pray and labor for the coming of Thy kingdom of peace and good will. Give us the intrepid spirit of the pioneer and patriot who revealed the splendor of their souls when the course which they pursued was beset by hardship and suffering.

May Thy ways of righteousness and justice and blessedness for all mankind become so clear and commanding that we shall never doubt and darken them by our indifference or by our heartless prejudices and selfish ambitions.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 872. An act to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-21.

SUNDRY FORMER STUDENTS OF THE AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps. I may say that an identical bill, H. R. 3562, passed the House on May 15.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Raymond Pohl, Jr., 505A Magnolia Avenue, Frederick, Md., $83.95; Dan K. Rawlings, 205 Laurel Avenue, Corbin, Ky., $13.10; Harold L. Reed, 201 West Lindell Street, West Frankfort, Ill., $12.20; Marcus A. Sessi, 417 West Pennview Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $8; Robert D. Simmons, 835½ Broadway, New Orleans, La., $23.85; Harry P. Smith, Jr., 2225 Chesapeake Avenue, Hampton, Va., $60.66; Paul E. Smith, 2109 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $6.10; Raymond C. Sowko, Glennland Apartments, State College, Pa., $444.40; Clyde C. Spears, 347 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky., $236.60; Donald E. Spears, 123 West Central Avenue, Belle, W. Va., $212.70; Homer R. Steele, route 1, Fairview, W. Va., $142; John D. Stiles, Wadestown, W. Va., $110.20; George F. Stock, Jr., Hollandale, Miss., $236.95; David A. Stockton, 105 East Seventh Street, box 256, Ritzville, Wash., $179.65; Frank A. Sullivan, 7949 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $396.80; William K. Sutton, 981 Fincastle Road, Lexington, Ky., $141.25; Floyd Ramsey Tarr, 3729 Marlamont Drive, Weirton, W. Va., $170.05; Hagop H. Terzagian, 217 Myrtle Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., $338.85; Jack Alfred Thalimer, 4518 West Grace Street, Richmond, Va., $226.80; Eugene R. Thomas, 9 South York Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $223.20; Forest G. Thompson, 2201 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Ky., $157.80; Joseph C. Thompson, box 700, O. M. S., Travis AFB, Fairview, Calif., $423.25; Thomas W. Tigertt, box 93, Wilmer, Tex., $583.90; Richard J. Torchia, 630 Dow Avenue, Carnegie, Pa., $229.80; Lee C. Truman, Jr., 2422 Allen Street, Owensboro, Ky., $252.40; Charles B. Upshaw, 394 West Wesley Road, Northwest, Atlanta, Ga., $191; George J. Walters, Jr., 438 South Dallas Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., $435.55; Gilbert Watz, 834 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., $366.45; Arthur J. Weinsten, 501 Manheim Street (22-A), Philadelphia, Pa., $200.10; Robert J. Weiss, 111 West Cherryhill Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $239.25; James Bernard Welborn, 442 Cherry Street, Russellville, Ky., $107.55; Earl M. Williams, box 204, Evarts, Ky., $297.50; Edwin J. Williams, Jr., 1832 Chuckatuck Avenue, Petersburg, Va., $505.60; Charles P. Wilson, Jr., route 1, Walkersville, W. Va., $404.16; and Harold W. Wilson, 205½ Fourth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., $324.20. The payment of said sums shall be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damages to or loss or destruction of personal property as a result of a fire that occurred on June 28, 1948, in the building in which they were quartered at Langley Air Force Base, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 3562 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Adair	Dingell	Miller, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Dorn	Miller, N. Y.
Angell	Elliott	Morgan
Bailey	Ellsworth	Moulder
Baker	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Granahan	Perkins
Beamer	Green	Poage
Bonner	Hall,	Powell
Bosone	Leonard W.	Ramsay
Bray	Halleck	Redden
Brownson	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Butler	Irving	Roberts
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Rogers, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kennedy	Roosevelt
Case	Kersten, Wis.	Sasscer
Chudoff	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
Colmer	Latham	Shelley
Crumpacker	McGrath	Sheppard
Dawson	Magee	Smith, Miss.
Deane	Marshall	Thomas

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on page A2283 of the RECORD the last sentence in column 1 should read "Its framers showed the world" instead of "Its farmers." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. NORRELL, be included as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Senate will be notified accordingly.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY TO THE PEOPLE OF EL SALVADOR

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas earthquakes of major proportions in El Salvador on May 6 and 7, 1951, have resulted in the loss of many lives, untold suffering, and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property, rendering homeless and destitute thousands of people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the deepest sympathy of the Congress and the people of the United States be extended to the President and the people of El Salvador in this dark hour of their suffering and distress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I should like to say that this is a resolution of sympathy to the people of El Salvador. A small country has suffered a grievous disaster in the earthquake shocks of last week. The gentleman from Missouri and I visited El Salvador last autumn in connection with the inauguration of their new president, Oscar Osorio, and while there we had an opportunity to see something of the country. It is a very friendly country to the United States, and has often demonstrated its friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I might observe that this resolution carries no appropriation, authorizes none, and involves no junkets for anybody. I hope it will receive, as I am sure it deserves, unanimously favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to comment that it should be remembered El Salvador has usually been the first country among our good neighbors to the south of us to come to the support of the United States in its international decisions. As I recall it El Salvador was the first nation to join in the declaration of war against Germany and Japan. I had an opportunity to visit El Salvador some years ago. I was asked to make a speech in Spanish in behalf of the American delegation there. They are a grand people, good neighbors, and good friends of ours. I join in the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF LAND BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, ETC. (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that under the Rules of the House I am entitled to 1 hour, during which time I can yield to other Members without, however, yielding the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a brief as to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I trust Members will give me their close attention because this is one of the most important bills or measures that will be considered by the House of Representatives during this session, for it has as its objective the keeping of control in the Congress of the United States over land acquisitions and disposals in the Department of Defense and the Civil Defense Administration. The Committee on Armed Services unanimously, and the committee is composed of some 35 members, respectfully request the House of Representatives to override the President's veto. The reason we do so is that we feel the Congress, representing the American people, should have knowledge of what happens in those departments.

Back in 1942 and 1943 an agreement was entered into by the old Committee on Naval Affairs with the Administration and with the then Secretary of the Navy Knox, whereby all acquisitions of real estate of every character and all leases would be submitted to the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. That understanding continued for 2 years. Then when the House Naval Affairs Committee was preparing a public works bill, we wrote a provision into the law carrying out that agreement that existed between President Roosevelt's administration, Secretary Knox, and the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate. Here is what that says:

Provided further, That prior to the acquisition or disposal, by lease or otherwise, of any land acquired for naval use under the authority of this, or any other act, the Secretary of the Navy shall come into agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the terms of such prospective acquisitions or disposals; and recital of compliance with this proviso in any instrument of conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this or any other act shall be conclusive evidence of the Secretary's compliance with this proviso as to the property conveyed.

That has been on the statute books since April 4, 1944. When the Armed Services Committee was created by the merging of the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee, all laws applicable to the Navy fell within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees. So since that time, since the Eightieth Congress, the Armed Services Committees have been administering for the Navy this law that was passed in 1944.

What this bill, House bill 3096, does is merely to extend that same principle to the Army and to the Air Force, because the present provision only extends to the Navy. We now say that we want to include this same principle, with some modifications. Any purchase of realty or any lease under $10,000 does not have to be submitted for the consideration of the committees.

The committee held a hearing on House bill 3096. It was unanimously passed by the committee. I appeared before the Rules Committee and obtained a rule, and the bill was unanimously passed by the House.

At the very time we were debating the bill, the Senate took up a companion bill dealing with the identical subject, which bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, and the same bill with the exception of only one word, was passed by the Senate. So when the House bill reached the Senate, the Senate adopted the House bill.

Now the President has written a veto and he says this is bad legislation. He says it will involve a delay. I disagree with the President in regard to that. I also disagree that it will involve a large personnel to administer it in the Department. In the Navy Department today there are only seven men who handle this matter that comes before the committees and House bill 3096 will require only four, a reduction of three. We process in the neighborhood of some 75 or 100 Navy requests nearly every month. We have a member of our staff and we have a special subcommittee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], and including the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and myself. We pass on these various items that come in and we promptly give consideration to them and notify the Department.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the question of delay, it has been my observation that experience is a pretty good teacher.

The gentleman has indicated that this process has been in operation with respect to the Navy for nearly 10 years?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct, 2 years by agreement and 7 by law.

Mr. COLE of New York. My question is, Does the gentleman know of a single instance with respect to the Navy where the Navy has been occasioned any delay whatsoever?

Mr. VINSON. I do not, unless there was good reason for the delay. As a matter of fact, there is no request at the White House from the Navy Department for a veto of this measure.

I may say further that there was no objection from the Department of Justice as to the constitutionality of this question of veto.

The Congress has the right to delegate either to a department or a bureau chief authority to carry out any provisions of law in reference to the acquisition of property or the making of leases.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that this practice of having the committee check up on these bids has saved the country untold millions of dollars?

Mr. VINSON. There is no question about it. You may be saving money by cutting down this appropriation and that appropriation, but this bill is where you can save millions of dollars, and that is what the Naval Affairs Committee did in years gone by.

Let us go one step further; the Army, during the last war, had the authority to go out, and it has the authority to do it today, and lease any hotel in the United States that it may see fit to lease. You might pick up the paper tomorrow morning and find where the Army, if it saw fit to do so, had taken over the Statler Hotel. What would be your responsibility? Your responsibility as it stands today would be merely to foot the bill, and you would have no voice in the acquisition.

During the last war it became so bad that the Truman committee in the Senate made an investigation of the leasing of the hotels on Miami Beach and other cities by the Army and Navy and wrote its report. Let me read you what Senator Truman said; here is what the distinguished President said back in 1944:

> The manner in which the hotel acquisition program was carried out resulted in many injustices which the War Department has shown little inclination to prevent. Some of these doubtless could be corrected by simple negotiation, particularly where final settlements have not yet been made. To correct others, the War Department may need further legal authority. The War Department should review the entire situation in detail and report to the proper legislative committees of the Congress.

Now, listen to this:

> It should be pointed out that the Navy Department advises the legislative committees of its real estate acquisitions in advance and keeps these committees advised of its situation.

That is all this bill proposes to do; it merely proposes that when the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force desire to obtain a piece of property that they lay the facts before the two committees.

We had a hearing. General Pick, the Chief of Engineers, was there, representing the Department of Defense. When we first drafted the bill he said the bill would cause them too much trouble and too much delay; so we said to him: "General, you can write the bill to suit yourself." He wrote the bill exempting rivers and harbors and flood control projects, and exempting leases on agricultural grazing permits. The balance of the bill he wrote—of course he is against it because all departmental officials are against Congress knowing what goes on. Let me read you what the general said as the reason why he was opposed to it: "Because you would have to be more cautious. Would you not?" "Absolutely," replied General Pick. They would have to make out a case; and he said that was the reason, that they would have to be more cautious in real estate transactions. Under the law today a commander of the Army in San Francisco may look out and say: "I want this building." He sends a notice to the Department in Washington and the Department says, "Take that building," and you have no voice in the matter, you know nothing about it until you read of it in the newspapers. They can say, with reference to any property in America, that they will lease it, and they can go one step further; they can acquire property for a manufacturing enterprise for the Department without ever submitting it to the Congress.

Let me show you what is happening right now. The Navy, in compliance with that request—and I will show you how these things happen—a few days ago said, and here is one of them that comes in now:

> The Department of the Navy is initiating action to enter into a supply contract with the Hudson Motor Car Co. for the manufacture of aircraft engines to support the accelerated aircraft-production program. In order that the Hudson Motor Car Co. can produce the engines, additional Government-owned facilities such as land, buildings, building equipment, test cells, and machine tools are required.
>
> The Bureau of Aeronautics proposes to construct the new plant, estimated cost of which is $30,000,000, on a site to be acquired by the Department of the Navy.

They then describe the site and state how much the appraised value is. When that reached the Armed Services Committee we said, "Let us have a little investigation of this." What happened? As a result of investigation the Navy made a further survey and withdrew the proposition to spend $30,000,000 to build a new plant at Detroit for the Hudson Automobile Co. because they found facilities in which they could carry on this work. Every day that same thing goes on.

All I am asking the Congress to do is to exercise the authority that the people have a right to expect of you to know what goes on when your public money is being spent. There is absolutely no unjustified delay. It will not cause any personnel difficulties anywhere down here in the departments. The Navy is doing it today with seven people and can do it under this bill with only four. Of course, the Army will have a little bit larger staff because the Army sometimes is not as cautious in the use of manpower as the other services are. But, nevertheless, it will require only a small group to administer this. It will be submitted to the committee and the committee will make an investigation.

That is what you are here for. If any man in this House that is sent here to exercise this responsibility will go back home and tell your people that you are sent to Washington only to appropriate money that the Department of Defense wants and you know nothing about it until the time comes to foot the bill, I guarantee if you make that kind of a statement they will send a man with a little more inquisitive mind to Washington.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the distinguished gentleman from Georgia care to comment upon the President's statement or his contention that by this legislation we would be trespassing upon the prerogatives of the executive department?

Mr. VINSON. Here is a brief covering that identical point. You do not trespass. You delegate to a bureau to do certain things. Now we are saying by law that instead of delegating it to the bureau, delegate it to yourself, delegate it to a committee here in Congress. That is all we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, last December we had up for consideration a military public works bill involving the expenditure of $1,658,000,000 to acquire property all over the United States. I may say to the House that another bill will be up for consideration in a few days to spend $6,000,000,000 or more for military public works. We wrote a provision in that public works bill that any real estate acquired under that bill or any other bill could not be disposed of except by a specific act of the Congress.

Now, the President had to sign the bill, but he wrote a message and he said, "I am opposed to section 407 of the bill because I do not want to require these departments to get an act of Congress when they dispose of real estate."

Let me go one step further. If we had had something like this on the statute books with reference to personal property, with reference to clothes, with reference to shoes, with reference to tanks and with reference to other equipment, we would not today be as short as we are, because one reason you are not putting today more men in the army, in your navy, and in your air force, is due to the fact that you do not have the equipment. They disposed of it because Congress had no control of it. Now, I have been here a long time, and I have been fighting during those years that I have been here for Congress to meet its responsibility and not delegate, every day of the week, more and more authority to the Executive.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

82D CONGRESS 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 484

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

MAY 18, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3587]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 27, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 21, 23, 30, 31, 32 and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$3,300,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$5,750,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, 25, 28, 33, and 34.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
M. J. KIRWAN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
GUY CORDON (with reservations),
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Chapter II

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 1—*Senate:* Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—*Payment to children of deceased Senator:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3—*Contingent expenses of the Senate:* Appropriates $17,878 for furniture and repairs as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5—*Payments to widows of deceased Representatives:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—*Senate Restaurants:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7—*Government Printing Office:* Reported in disagreement.

Chapter III

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 8—*Federal Bureau of Investigation:* Appropriates $5,872,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,147,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9—*Federal Prison System:* Appropriates $449,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—*Civil Aeronautics Board:* Deletes the House proposal of an additional amount of $25,000 for "Salaries and expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 11—*Coast Guard:* Strikes out House provision to appropriate an additional $1,000,000 for "Operating expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 12—*Postal operations:* Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter V

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendment No. 13—*Office of Education:* Reported in disagreement.

Chapter VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 14—*Control of forest pests:* Strikes out the Senate proposal to appropriate $345,000 for "Forest Pest Control Act", as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—*Forest Service:* Appropriates $3,300,000 for "Forest development roads and trails", instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed is to provide $2,500,000 for construction and $800,000 for repairs.

Chapter VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 16—*Bureau of Mines:* Strikes out Senate proposal to appropriate $350,000 for construction, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—*Territories and island possessions:* Appropriates $4,000,000 for "Construction, Alaska Railroad", as proposed by the House instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that if necessary up to $500,000 of funds already appropriated may be utilized for constructing shops at Anchorage, it being understood that any such additional funds will not be replaced by new appropriations.

Chapter VIII

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 18—*Office of the Housing Expediter:* Reported in disagreement.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 19—*Vessel operations, revolving fund:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20—*Vessel operations, revolving fund:* Deletes Senate language as proposed by the House.

Chapter IX

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Amendment No. 21—Changes title as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter X

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE WORK

Amendment No. 22—Appropriates $5,750,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed in approving this figure that the contribution of the United States to this program shall not exceed one-third of total funds contributed to the program by all countries.

Chapter XI

EXPENSES OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Amendment No. 23—Appropriates $27,331,895 as proposed by the Senate instead of $33,029,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24—Strikes out Senate language for transfer of funds as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25—Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 26—Deletes Senate language for inclusion of security guard services as proposed by the House.

Amdendment No. 27—*Operations:* Appropriates $1,750,000 of which $110,000 shall be available for civil defense communication systems as proposed by the House instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—*Federal contributions:* Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—*Civil defense procurement fund:* Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—*Civil defense emergency fund:* Strikes out House proposal to appropriate $100,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter XII

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32—Appropriates $3,103,881 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,999,045 as proposed by the House and include the claims as set forth in Senate Document No. 25.

Chapter XIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 33, relating to wages paid those who advocate or belong to organizations which advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34, relating to funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35—Changes section number as proposed by the Senate.

Clarence Cannon,
Albert Thomas,
W. F. Norrell,
Jamie L. Whitten,
John Taber,
R. B. Wigglesworth,
Glenn R. Davis,
Managers on the Part of the House.

O

it would be necessary for him to move to reconsider the vote by which an amendment was agreed to and, then, if the amendment were rejected, the House language would be reinstated. That procedure would be in order, if a Senator wanted to have the House language reinstated, would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it would be in order to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. That being so, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia another question? The language of section 8, beginning in line 21 on page 11 and ending on line 7 on page 12, has been stricken by the committee. That is the section dealing with agricultural commodity price support. The bill as passed by the House provided that no concessions should be made which would reduce the price of agricultural products below the parity price. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I think the Senator's interpretation is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In looking through the report rather hastily, I have not found—no doubt they are in the report—the reasons why the Senate committee struck out the House language of section 8. The distinguished Senator from Georgia recalls, I am sure, the long debate we had about the importation of Canadian potatoes. I am also sure he recalls that at one time the tariff on imported Canadian potatoes, if I remember correctly, was reduced to as low as about 65 or 75 cents a hundred pounds. I think that was about the figure. At the same time in the United States the support price was about $2 a bushel. This permitted the importation of Canadian potatoes, and, as I recall, upwards of 15,000,000 bushels came into this country. I am not sure that all the 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes came from Canada. I make no reflection on Canada. The potatoes, however, came into this country. At the same time we had a surplus of potatoes and were selling them for, I believe, 1 cent a hundred pounds—perhaps I am mistaken and the price was $1 a hundred pounds—in order to get rid of the potatoes in the market. At that time there was considerable debate over the principle of permitting the importation of potatoes into this country while permitting the tariff on them to be reduced to a point which was below the support price.

I do not now argue whether support prices are right or wrong, but inasmuch as there is a support price, there seems to be a strong indication that the end result is that although the Canadian farmers came into a market which had a support price, yet the tariff was so low that they could sell the potatoes and still net $1.25 or $1.50 a bushel, and thus we were simply subsidizing the Canadian farmers on the importation of those potatoes. I notice the House wrote into the bill language dealing with that situation. I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if he will give an explanation as to why the Senate committee struck out the House language.

Mr. GEORGE. I have done so. The Senator was not present.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry. I was attending a committee meeting.

Mr. GEORGE. I read from the committee report, which, by the way, was unanimous. The following is from page 7 of the committee report:

> The House-approved amendment which would have prevented tariff concessions from applying to imported agricultural commodities being sold under a price-support program in the United States has been deleted. It was felt that the intermittent application and withdrawal of price supports would make concessions on the products concerned untenable. The uncertainties growing out of such operations would interfere with or obstruct the normal trade in price-supported products.

It must be remembered that we export five times as much as we import of this type of products.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean potatoes?

Mr. GEORGE. I mean agricultural products.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. GEORGE. We import potatoes and we export potatoes. We are large exporters of potatoes.

I invite attention to the following language from the committee report:

> Your committee adopted an amendment designed to protect the full operation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. If a case should arise where required action under section 22 would conflict with any trade agreement, then the action under section 22 shall prevail.

So complete protection can be given under the new provision which we have placed in the bill, making it mandatory upon the President to see that something is done to protect an agricultural commodity which is being supported under section 22. The President can do that, of course, as provided in section 22. What the bill does is to repeal subsection (f), which got into the act as an amendment, and which rather required section 22 to conform to the agreements. I believe that when the Senator considers what the House language did, he will see that, as a matter of tariff making, it is an impossible program. I read the sentence again:

> It was felt that the intermittent application and withdrawal of price supports would make concessions on the products concerned untenable.

It would be impossible to negotiate agreements with respect to them, because there would be no certainty about their operation. Since our exports of agricultural commodities exceed our imports by a considerable margin, it was felt by the committee that there ought to be certainty in the law.

The bill removes subsection (f) from section 22, and leaves section 22 in such a condition that it prevails over the agreement.

We also amended the escape clause. We took great care in amending the escape clause. The committee gave a great deal of attention to it. It seems to me that we have taken care of the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask another question. First, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the amendment found on page 13, in subsection (f), is a splendid addition to the bill. The action of Congress with respect to a previous bill apparently permitted the State Department to override these agreements, which caused some difficulty. I believe that subsection (f) is a very good amendment. But I do not see how that in any way affects the proposal of the House, unless it supersedes it. However, in my opinion, it is not a cure-all.

Mr. GEORGE. Under section 22 the President would be authorized to establish a quota on imports of an agricultural product. There is nothing to restrain him. It affords the broadest possible protection.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator states that the aid upon which we might rely is that the President, after he has been advised by the Tariff Commission, or from other sources, may establish quotas under section 22.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; he may establish quotas.

Mr. WHERRY. Has he that right now?

Mr. GEORGE. He cannot do it now.

Mr. WHERRY. Quotas have been established——

Mr. GEORGE. We propose to repeal subsection (f). That repeal would assist the President in establishing quotas. Furthermore, under the escape clause any interested party can invoke the escape clause.

With those provisions, it would seem that agricultural products the price of which we were supporting could very well be protected. I agree with the Senator that it is illogical to support the price of a farm commodity and at the same time so reduce the protection of that particular price as to permit its undercutting and undermining.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will further yield, for the life of me I cannot see how, under the escape clause, we get legislation which is helpful. I can see that pursuant to the terms of section 8, under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, if a condition exists requiring emergency treatment, the Tariff Commission shall make an investigation. I think that is a good thing. However, that is not mandatory. There is nothing in the provision which nullifies a concession already made. All that can be done is to investigate. Where is there any legislative relief? In the event a concession is made by the President as a result of which agricultural products come into the United States below the support price, is there any way, legislatively, to prohibit such a condition by increasing the tariff, or affording some definite relief, rather than merely suggesting the problem to the President of the United States for his consideration?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if a perishable product is involved, the Secretary of Agriculture can put in motion all the relief provisions of these several amendments. The Secretary of Agriculture can call upon the President and

upon the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission must act expeditiously, and the President is given direct authority to act without waiting for the report of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree to all that.

Mr. GEORGE. In the event that the price of an agricultural commodity is being supported, or other support measures have been taken in conformity with section 22, if a question arises, the case must be adjudged on its own merits. The President has not only ample power to deal with rates in that instance, but he has express power, I should say, to establish a quota.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to take up too much time. With the exception of the escape clause, all the steps which the distinguished Senator has mentioned were followed in the case of potatoes. The President was advised; the Secretary of State was advised; the Secretary of Agriculture was advised; and in the final analysis nothing was done. The potatoes continued to come into the United States. They came in with so little protection——

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that section 22 could not apply because of the agreement. We have amended section 22. We have taken out the prohibition. It does now apply.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just commended the Senator and the committee for the very fine work in connection with the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. That amendment, coupled with the escape clause, certainly should give agriculture protection.

Mr. WHERRY. All the amendment does is to bar the State Department or the President from overriding the law as we make it.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. However, when the Senator complained before about potatoes, the agreement at that time was outstanding, and the President could not act under section 22. No action could be taken under section 22 because of the agreement itself. We have removed that impediment or inhibition. Quotas can be imposed and complete protection can be given to a commodity which is supported by any one of our farm programs.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, what the legislative effect of the amendment would be, I am not certain. I have a great respect for the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia and for the minority member oft he committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I have discussed the matter personally with him. Perhaps subsection (f) does go a long way toward resolving the difficulty with respect to the importation of agricultural products. However, even though it be adhered to, the point I am making is that there is absent any requirement that the President or the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the good suggestions of the Senator from Georgia. In the final analysis, as I read the bill, all we can hope for is an immediate investigation by the Tariff Commission. Then they would make their recommendations to the President. We have a discretionary situation in which the President may take immediate action. The bill does not say he must take action.

Mr. GEORGE. Section 22 requires the President to act. I believe if the Senator will read section 22 he will see that the fullest power is there given, and that a direct and mandatory requirement is placed upon the President. At least that is my understanding of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to hear the Senator say so. I am glad to have his interpretation of section 22 of the Agricultural Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 33 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, 25, 28, and 34, to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 27, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 21, 23, 30, 31, 32 and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$5,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, 25, 28, 33, and 34.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
GUY CORDON (with reservations),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered, and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3587, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 21, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 33 to the bill (H. R. 3587), entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum of "$1,000,000," named in said amendment, insert "$1,750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter stricken by the said amendment insert:

"No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for maritime activities, by this or any other act shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor (except in cases where sec. 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable), is computed in accordance with subsec. 902 (a) of said act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert: "and transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporation as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realine its regular programs."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to said bill and concur therein with

the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

"For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (1) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $25,000,000, to be equally matched with State funds, of which $20,000,000 shall be for medical supplies and equipment and $5,000,000 for training and education, to remain available to June 30, 1952."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel, or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation any article or commodity of the nature or class described: *Provided,* That after the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act and prior to the termination of the period heretofore referred to no country shall be eligible for economic or financial assistance under any such act unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armaments, military matériel, articles, or commodities, which are subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided further,* That such certification shall not relieve the Administrator for Economic Cooperation or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided further,* That exceptions to these provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States: *Provided further,* That the National Security Council shall immediately report any exception made with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the National Security Council shall at least once each quarter review all exceptions made previously and shall report its determinations to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which an exception is made.

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, 25, 28, and 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I understand that the Senate has now adopted the conference report and has agreed to the several amendments of the House to certain Senate amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 34 one of the amendments which has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be printed an analysis of amendment 34, as prepared by legislative counsel.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

As it passed the Senate, the so-called KEM amendment provided that during a period in which our Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities, while carrying out a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance should be extended to any foreign country which exports arms, armaments, or military matériel, or commodities which the Secretary of Defense certifies may be used in the manufacture thereof, to Russia or any of her satellites, including Communist China and Communist North Korea.

The conferees modified the amendment in the three following respects:

1. The amendment agreed upon by the conferees covers not only arms, armaments, and military matériel, and articles and commodities which the Secretary of Defense certifies may be used for the manufacture thereof, but also includes any article or commodity, regardless of its nature, if the shipment thereof to Russia and her satellites is embargoed by the United States in the interests of national security.

2. The second change made by the conferees is the addition of the matter contained in the first two provisos.

The purpose of this addition is to provide a means for enforcing the amendment, by requiring all countries receiving economic or financial aid from the United States to certify, as a condition of eligibility for such aid, that they have not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this bill, shipped to Russia or any of her satellites any of the items covered by the amendment; that is, arms, armaments, or military matériel; articles or commodities which may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel; and articles or commodities the shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States.

No aid could be furnished subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment in the absence of such a certification.

Also, the certification much have been obtained within 30 days prior to the time the aid is extended, so that countries receiving more or less continuous aid would be required to make monthly certifications.

In order that the various countries receiving aid from the United States will have notice of our intention to cut off aid if they continue to export prohibited items to Russia or any of her satellites, the period to be certified to, will not commence until the fifteenth day following the date of enactment.

As a result the first certification, in the case of a country to which aid is to be extended shortly after such fifteenth day, will necessarily refer to trade during only a short period of time.

For example, a country seeking aid on the sixteenth day following the date of enactment may be able to qualify therefor merely by certifying that it did not engage in the prohibited trade on that day.

If it continued to receive aid, however, it would be required to certify again 30 days thereafter that it had not exported those items to the Soviet bloc subsequent to the fifteenth day following the enactment of this bill.

It should perhaps be pointed out that these provisions are not intended to result in a denial of assistance to a country merely because it has exported an item which at the time of certification is on the prohibited list, if at the time of the exportation such item had been placed on the prohibited list.

The second proviso was included simply for the purpose of making clear that the certification machinery is in addition to, and not in lieu of, other means of enforcement of the provisions of the amendment. In other words, it would be the duty of the ECA Administrator to terminate assistance to a country, even though it had made the necessary certification, if he determined through other means that it was engaged in the prohibited trade.

3. The last two provisos would authorize the National Security Council to make exceptions from the provisions of the amendment where, in its opinion, to do so would be in the security interest of the United States. In such case, a country can continue to receive aid from the United States even though it exports the item with respect to which exception is made to Russia or one of her satellites and cannot, therefore, make the certification required by this amendment with respect to that item.

Immediate reports of all such exceptions made by the National Security Council must be made to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committee of both Houses, and to the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, respectively, setting forth the reasons for such exceptions and an analysis of the particular country's trade with the Soviet bloc.

In addition, the National Security Council would be required to submit quarterly reports to the same committees, reviewing the exceptions made during the preceding quarter.

The last subsection of the amendment repeals the existing law on this subject which, it will be recalled, was enacted last fall as a part of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, and which merely prohibits the furnishing of economic or financial assistance to countries whose trade with Russia or any of its satellites is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

The difficulty has been that the National Security Council has failed to look. If it had looked, as required by law, it would have found much trade in materials helpful to the enemy.

And this is why mandatory legislation is now needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a

question with reference to the amendment dealing with the International Children's Fund. I note that the explanation reads:

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $5,750,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed in approving this figure that the contribution of the United States to this program shall not exceed one-third of total funds contributed to the program by all countries.

My question of the Senator from Arizona is whether the phrase "total fund contributed to the program by all countries" includes not only the direct contributions to the children's fund, but also the estimated local contributions by recipient countries which are made to match children's fund imports under the agreement with each of the recipient countries.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is very difficult to say how an administrative agency would interpret an amendment of that kind, but my understanding is that contributions are made by the United States and contributions are made by other nations, which become available to the children's fund when met by equal amounts contributed by the country in which the funds are to be expended. In other words, if we were to raise one-third of the first dollar, that dollar must be matched again by another dollar in the country which receives the aid, so that the total amount to be expended for the benefit of the children in that country would be $2. It would seem to me reasonable to interpret this language to mean that one-third of that amount could be contributed by the United States.

Mr. HILL. One-third of the total funds that have been described by the Senator from Arizona; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that is the way the report reads.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think amendment 34 is a distinct gain for the American people. The vast amounts of strategic materials and war materials which have been moving into Communist China through Hong Kong in my judgment are a shame and a disgrace. I believe this amendment is in one way an improvement over an amendment which was adopted by the Senate a few days ago. The amendment includes the words:

Shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security.

In that respect I think the amendment as submitted by the committee of conference is an improvement.

At the same time I am sorry to see inserted a provision which gives the National Security Council any discretionary power to permit a continuance of this trade. However, if the National Security Council reports to the committees of Congress what it is doing, so that the facts will be immediately known to the public, I do not believe any great amount of harm will be done in that respect.

I am glad the amendment has been adopted. The only pity is, Mr. President, that is comes 65,000 casualties too late.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment with respect to the action just taken by the Senate on the conference report.

First, I should like to commend the Senate members of the committee of conference, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and other Senators who have labored so diligently to bring about this result. I think it is unquestionably a step in the right direction. However, Mr. President, it will be of little avail unless it is enforced vigilantly and with a will to carry out the decision of the Congress.

I regret very much to say that the action previously taken by the Congress was not carried out diligently and efficiently by United States officials or by officials of our supposed allies.

At this very hour there is in Eastern Germany, and also working into Western Germany, a Chinese mission, sent there by the Communist government of China, and negotiating on this very day with establishments in Western Germany, under the jurisdiction of the allied powers, to secure strategic materials to be sent behind the iron curtain and unquestionably to be used in building up the military and industrial potential of the Communists.

When we realize that the trade through Hong Kong has increased by three times between 1949 and 1950, and that the trade from Germany with Communist China has increased 2,700 percent between 1949 and 1950; when we have shown that the illegal German trade with the Russian bloc is now approximately $100,000,000 annually; when our observers found in the last month that whole trainloads of material are being sent, and that a truck carrying 30 tons of equipment or supplies is moving across the border every 3 minutes, with little or no detention and no inspection, it certainly is a sorry state of affairs.

I regret to say that these conditions are not new or of recent origin. Two years ago these conditions were reported officially to our representatives. They were informed that there was no attempt at enforcement on the interzonal or international borders, that there have been an inefficient licensing system, a lack of centralized control, and abundant opportunities for fraud and forgery, which have been taken advantage of, and that the border is wide open, as a result of which strategic materials have been flowing across the border, to places behind the iron curtain. That situation certainly represents one of the darkest pages in the history of the present crisis.

I express the hope that our officials will live up to their responsibilities and will step into this very important situation with a will and a determination to put a stop to the flow of strategic materials into the hands of the Communists, to be used against the American boys who now are fighting for survival.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because I know he spent considerable time on the amendment. I wish to thank him for his effort and his advice, because he was conducting the hearings which have shown the amount of trade and the kind of trade which was going on between the various countries.

I wish to ask the Senator whether it will be well for the State Department and the military authorities to consider very seriously this question, realizing that we are at war, and that if we trade with the enemy—whether it be the soldiers who are fighting for Soviet China or Red Korea or the army which is directing the fight from Moscow—when we give them aid and comfort we are, in effect, giving aid and comfort to an enemy of the United States as of today, because we are at war with a part of them in fact, and to all intents and purposes we are at war with the real enemies in the Kremlin. So our officials should consider that we should not give aid and comfort to those enemies, but should realize that we are really at war. Is not that a fact?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think the Senator is eminently correct. I think that in every respect the approach he has stated is the realistic approach of today. I shall go further by saying to the Senator that, in addition to any step toward giving direct help from America to the enemy countries, the use of ECA funds by the western European powers, in turn, to build up their industrial capacity, only to have it used—as it has been used in the past—to supply the Communist countries, certainly creates a very unfortunate situation which is defeating the very purposes for which ECA was originated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Maryland feel that when we are sending money to arm and give economic aid to these countries, if they give material aid to the enemy, whether it is the enemy in the cold war or the enemy in the hot war, they in effect are destroying their own economic and their own political systems? Does not the Senator agree that the countries we aid must keep that in mind; and that when we make a variation at this time and allow this trade or any trade to go on between those countries, our public officials must keep in mind that the trade must be allowed only on the condition that it will benefit the security of the United States and her allies?

Mr. O'CONOR. That should be the only consideration on the basis of which the trade can be justified, in my opinion.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the officials certify to Congress and to the congressional committees in regard to the trade, is it not important that our committees—I refer not only to the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee, but also to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which the Senator from Maryland also serves—should scrutinize very carefully every such transaction, to determine for the people back home whether the transaction is for the security of the United States, which means that it is for the security of our country and our allies

in this war against communism. Does not the Senator from Maryland agree?

Mr. O'CONOR. I certainly agree with the Senator in everything he said in urging the necessity for the closest and most unremitting follow-up in regard to these matters. We find two situations which are illustrative. First, a list is published which on its face appears to be a clear prohibition against sending certain articles across the border, as, for example, 20-ton cranes, about which the Senator from Delaware and I heard. There was a mere change in the size, so they weight but 18 tons and they have been going over regularly. Second, when there was a prohibition against sending an entire factory across, the shippers broke it up into 89 parts and sent over the parts, to be assembled behind the iron curtain, with the same result, of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Regarding that kind of trade, it is very difficult for a committee of Congress, when it merely sees the items, to determine that they would aid the enemy; but those who are in authority in our armed forces and in our security division ought to scrutinize carefully a situation in which a factory is being divided into 89 parts, the purpose being, in effect, to deceive ourselves, and really to aid the enemy.

Mr. O'CONOR. I agree with the Senator entirely.

Mr. FERGUSON. The mere changing of the 20-ton crane to an 18-ton crane, of course, does not at all alter the fact.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct. I agree with the Senator entirely.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Potsdam agreement, it was provided, was it not, that reparations should be sent to Russia?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think that is a different question from the one with which we are concerned at this time. We are concerned with ECA aid to the Western European countries.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that perfectly, but is it not simply a continuation of what took place when the Potsdam Agreement was made?

Mr. O'CONOR. I understand exactly what it is to which the Senator is referring. I believe there is a distinction, however, between what was done under the Potsdam agreement and the more recent East-West trade, which is entirely, or in part, controlled by the United States, or by the allied powers, because there is a tripartite agreement, as of course the Senator is well aware, which affords to the United States, to Britain, and to France authority over shipments which unquestionably should have been prohibited before this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask two questions of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before we get through with it——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to ask a question in connection with the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question regarding the conference report?

Mr. O'CONOR. I gladly yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What action did the conferees take on the amendment relating to the purchase or requisitioning by the Government of American shipping?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think it would be necessary for the Senator from Delaware to ask the Senator from Tennessee, or the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona can answer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona answer that question?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate struck out the language in the bill, as the Senator will remember, and adopted his amendment. That provision of the bill was stricken out, and in lieu of it the following language was inserted:

> No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for maritime activities, by this or any other act, shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor (except in cases where sec. 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable), is computed in accordance with subsection 902a of said act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office.

In other words, instead of their being able to get the full value of a ship at the time it was lost, the Government can take care that it does not pay more than what had originally been paid for the ship. The amendment agreed to, as I understand, is one drafted by the General Accounting Office, which, it is claimed by them, makes the provision constitutional.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the conference committee, in substance, accepted an amendment recommended by the General Accounting Office; did it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to address a question either to the Senator from Arizona or to the Senator from New Hampshire, with respect to amendment 22. It relates to the International Children's Welfare Fund. I notice language is used which is in the nature of a limitation, to the effect that "not to exceed one-third of the total funds contributed to the programs by all countries" shall be the measure of what is contributed by the United States.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that children have been the real wrecks of war, not only in Europe, but elsewhere; and one of the fine things this country has done has been to bend over on the side of generosity in behalf of those future citizens of other countries of the world. I had an opportunity to see the operations of this fund at first hand. I saw the expressions of gratitude by children as they wrote poems and drew pictures and somehow expressed in their childish way what came from the heart.

If I read the language correctly, it would exclude the contributions which are made in kind, as a sort of counterpart, by the recipient countries, which, as I understand, aggregate about $150,000,000. If that is the purport of the language, then obviously the contribution by this country in any one year would be severely limited, and would probably be reduced to approximately $2,000,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year, which, obviously, would be a very small amount, indeed, with which to carry on a supply program which is so extensive, and which relates to so many millions of children throughout the world.

I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona can clarify that point, or whether the Senator from New Hampshire can clarify it, so that those who will have under their authority the approval of the expenditure of this money will have a clear indication of the real intention of the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Oregon a moment ago indicated that perhaps my interpretation was erroneous. When we had this matter under discussion in the conference, I pointed out that there was an original contribution by the United States. There are also contributions by other nations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The dollar which is obtained in that way goes to some country where there are children who need help, which country must put up at least another dollar.

From a reading of the language, and from the way it is written in the report, my interpretation would be that our contribution "shall not exceed one-third of total funds contributed to the program by all countries."

Mr. DIRKSEN. By "contributions," does the Senator include also the $150,000,000 which has been contributed or made available by the recipient countries since this program got under way?

Mr. HAYDEN. The language is "all other countries." I have stated my interpretation. The language could be narrowly interpreted to mean only the contributions by the United States and the country matching United States funds, and stop right there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do other members of the subcommittee join and concur in the interpretation made by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will have to ask them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the Senator from Illinois is in error, if he means that this will apply only to those within the original pool. I was hoping that that would be true of this particular appropriation, but, after making some inquiry, I am inclined to the opinion that the words "contributions to the program by all countries" mean that it will not be in excess of one-third for the contributing countries and those who have to match the contributions; so we have two funds, namely, a contributing fund and a matching fund. Therefore, when reference is made to "all countries" and the contributions to the program, it includes both the contributing fund and the matching fund, which, as has been said, will greatly reduce the amount of this fund.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Michigan for information in dollars and cents. Obviously, the Senator from Illinois cannot be in error, because he is merely very patiently seeking light on this subject and trying to divine the intentions of the conferees. Suppose the Senator puts the answer in dollars and cents.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I should like to do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Five million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars is made available under the program. How much will the administration be able to spend during the remainder of the fiscal year?

Mr. FERGUSON. They will be able to spend up to $5,700,000, not more than one-third of the total. Other nations will contribute to the amount. Let us consider three times that amount should be available, which would mean approximately $17,000,000, and assume that other countries will contribute another $17,000,000. That would mean that $34,000,000 might be contributed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am trying to find out how much, in dollars and cents, will be available. First, we make a contribution. Second, those nations which make contributions for relief outside their borders are in the next category. Third, there are the recipient countries. In all, they have put up, in what may be called counterpart funds, probably $150,000,000. But they are on the receiving end. If we consider all three categories of countries, how much, in dollars and cents, would be available?

Mr. FERGUSON. We could contribute only the amount appropriated, which is $5,750,000, not more than an amount equal to one-third of the total amount. Of course, there are private contributions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, we are not concerned with them at the moment.

Mr. FERGUSON. This provision does cut down the amount that will be contributed under the plan. The original contribution permitted was 72 percent. On the insistence of the House, that was cut so that we can now contribute 33⅓ percent, instead of 72 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I dislike to be persistent, but I am sure that some member of the committee must know how much, in dollars and cents, the sum will amount to. Do not the hearings disclose that fact?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not the conference hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There should be some reasonably finite idea as to the amount, whether $2,000,000, $3,000,000, or how much will be available.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount available is the amount of money appropriated, which is $5,750,000, provided it is matched by other countries, including the country where it is received.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A list was available showing the total amount of the contributions by the contributing countries for aid beyond their borders, and the whole amount which was made up by the recipient countries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress obviously cannot take $5,750,000 and make it match, on a one-third basis, $150,000,000. We can go to the extent of $5,750,000 and come within the rule. The report makes $5,750,000 available for the purpose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have before me the House report on the conference agreement. It provides $5,750,000 instead of the $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The report states that the conferees are agreed that the contribution of the United States to the program shall not exceed one-third of the total funds—I emphasize the words "total funds"—contributed to the program by all countries. So it seems that the United States can put up $5,750,000, provided that amount does not exceed one third of the total funds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The "total fund" means contributed funds and matching funds, does it?

Mr. HILL. "Total" means all funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is nothing in the report that would prohibit a contributing State from putting up $150,000,000. So long as we keep within the 33⅓ percent, American money to the extent of $5,750,000 can be used.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that answers the question, but I wanted to be sure.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], if the Senator from Illinois has concluded his inquiries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was about to relinquish this line of inquiry, except to emphasize once more that while I am on record as being against all kinds of foreign aid, there is one field in which we do ourselves proud, and where we get a return for our money. That is in the case of the tots and youngsters in the formative stages who still know something about the virtues of gratitude and who express their appreciation to this country. So I wanted to be reasonably certain that there would be adequate funds to carry on, because this is one feature on which we can look back with pride.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from Colorado are very much interested in securing an appropriation which could be used to heal the ravages in our western forests caused by beetle infestation. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate was very helpful to us, as was also the Senate itself. My inquiries indicate that the item was dropped out in the conference, and my inquiries also indicate that it would have been useless to take the question back to the conference. I wonder if I may have the observations of the distinguished Senator from Arizona on that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is quite correct. I think every member of the Senate committee was convinced that the appropriation to which the Senator refers was meritorious, and should have been allowed, but we found the House conferees adamant with reference to the item. The Senator from Colorado can bring up the matter again when the regular appropriation bill comes before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to say that I have never seen House conferees more adamant on any question than they were on this item. However, I am sure the Senator will have a good chance in the future to have the item allowed. The Senate members of the conference were overwhelmingly in favor of the amendment, but the House conferees were opposed to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado and myself, I should like to express our gratitude to the conferees for the hard fight they put up when the question was in the conference. I hope the item may receive better consideration in connection with the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senate conferees were unanimous in their position, but we encountered united opposition on the part of the House conferees. They said that the matter would be given consideration in connection with the whole policy in the regular appropriation bill. Finally, when we reached an impasse, we reluctantly yielded.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator agree that it would have been useless to take the question back to conference?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mean, to reject the report and have it reconsidered by the conference committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think there would have been any change.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if all Senators have concluded, I should like to refer to the so-called Kem amendment, about which much has been said. I voted for that amendment, and I think every other member of the committee

voted for it. But in the conference it was pointed out that certain exceptions should be made. I send to the desk a copy of the amendment which has now been agreed to, and ask that the clerk read it. I ask all Senators to listen as the amendment is read, because I think it is a long step in the right direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report has been agreed to, but if there be no objection the clerk may read the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with this matter. In line with what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has said respecting the Kem amendment, I have just been informed of, and it was very interesting to me to read on the ticker the news that the British high court in Hong Kong today—or at least the report has come in today—has decided to award the 40 airplanes, ownership of which was under consideration by that court, to the Communist Government of Red China. Certainly that is a very helpful action.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I am not at all surprised at the action taken by the British court. I do not think they have treated us right about the matter. That is why I voted for the Kem amendment, and that is why I voted for the amendment which I earnestly ask the Senators may listen to as it is read by the clerk.

Mr. BRIDGES. The planes in question, if Members of the Senate will recall, are the planes which were sold to certain American-Chinese Nationalist interests. The 40 planes will be used in the making of war. The decision has been under consideration by the British high court in Hong Kong. And just a short time ago over the ticker comes the word that the high court in Hong Kong has awarded the planes to the Communists of Red China, so they will have 40 more airplanes to attack American boys and kill American boys. That is a sad commentary, but it is true. It affords one more reason why the Kem amendment should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Tennessee will be read for the information of the Senate. The Chair will say to the Senator that the amendment has been adopted.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel, or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation any article or commodity of the nature or class described: *Provided*, That after the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act and prior to the termination of the period heretofore referred to no country shall be eligible for economic or financial assistance under any such act unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armaments, military matériel, articles or commodities, which are subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided further*, That such certification shall not relieve the Administrator for Economic Cooperation or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided further*, That exceptions to these provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That the National Security Council shall immediately report any exception made with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the National Security Council shall at least once each quarter review all exceptions made previously and shall report its determinations to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which an exception is made.

(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not detain the Senate when the conference report was brought up for consideration or during the consideration of the House amendments to the Senate amendments because I did not care to delay unduly the bill which is before the Senate as the unfinished business. At that time, however, I asked that a statement be inserted in the RECORD. It is an analysis which was prepared by the legislative counsel, which gave their interpretation of the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has just requested to have read.

Mr. President, I think the amendment greatly strengthens what the Senate by its vote in passing the bill attempted to do, which was to shut off aid to Russia or her satellite countries that in turn are furnishing aid to Communist China. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think if the provisions of the amendment are honestly, fairly, and justly administered by the officials whose duty it is to carry out its terms, and especially by the Security Council, that that will have the effect of cutting off aid to Communist China?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is an absolute "Yes." Of course, in that respect, I should like to say that a law is just as good as its administration. The Congress has done what it could do to provide an effective law. If, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee indicated in his question, that law is fairly and honestly administered, there can be no doubt as to its effectiveness. Had this been the law previously, there is no doubt that the sale of the 40 airplanes could not have been made at the time it was made.

The language of the amendment is identical with language submitted a year ago, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, with the exception that is further strengthened by this clause: "or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security."

We have an embargo on goods to Red China, and the amendment provides that all the ECA countries shall put into effect a similar embargo to Red China or they will be cut off completely from further ECA aid. So I can answer the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in the affirmative, with a considerable degree of force. Had the amendment been in effect previously there would not have been a sale of 40 airplanes to Red China by Great Britain or by any other ECA country. They would have been required to place an embargo on such airplanes before they could receive any further ECA aid.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee respecting the honesty and fair administration of the provisions of the amendment is very pertinent. I wonder if the Senator is aware that we put a specific mandate in the law last year against the use of any ECA funds by a country, a protectorate of which was violating the rights of American citizens, a mandate which referred specifically to the Moroccan situation? I do not know if the Senator is aware that not only is the ECA failing to carry out such a specific mandate of law, but that the State Department has connived to permit the French Government, which has no right to do so, to take the problem into the World Court. Is the Senator aware that we are still going ahead and giving ECA aid in spite of what Congress has said? Our State Department is surrendering our rights by permitting the French to take this problem to the International Court which has no right to review the matter in the first place. It is a subterfuge, a ruse, and a device to avoid enforcing the law which Congress enacted. I believe that that question was very properly raised. Will this law will be enforced if we enact it? I am not too sanguine, in the light of past experience. There are those who wish to avoid the

law and disregard what the Congress has told them to do.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the Senator that I have not been too happy with the administration of the Secretary of State. I think my position on that question is well known throughout the country. I will say, however, that I believe that this embargo is one of the best provisions of the new amendment.

There is also another provision which I think will be very helpful, now that the question has been raised. In this amendment it is provided that ECA shall carry out the mandate of Congress. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that this provision is now mandatory, rather than permissive.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The provision of the law last year was completely mandatory.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe that if the Senator will read the Cannon amendment, he will discover that it was watered down considerably. The provision which passed the Senate was mandatory, but when the bill got through conference and the Cannon amendment emerged it was not mandatory. I believe that if the Senator will read it he will find that it was watered down considerably from the standpoint of being a mandatory amendment.

But be that as it may, my feeling is that it is an improvement to have the additional provision in this amendment that the ECA shall see to it that the provisions of the amendment are carried out, plus an embargo against the articles which we do not permit to be shipped to Red China.

There is a further provision, which I think is a good one, namely, that before a country can get aid from ECA or any other financial agency of this Government, it is absolutely necessary that such country certify that for the previous 30 days and for the period of time from the 15th day after the passage of this act on, it has not in any way engaged in the sale of or trading in strategic materials destined for the satellite countries or for Russia. With that provision properly enforced, we do not need to depend on ECA alone to administer the act as the distinguished Senator from Iowa has brought out. We provide that the various countries shall, on their honor, make much a certification. If that is not done, and if the materials continue to flow from Western Germany through Eastern Germany, to the tune of $100,000,000 annually, as the distinguished Senator from Maryland pointed out a moment ago, and if a country certifies in dishonor, I should like to see the board or the administrator who would override a decision and make such a report known to the committees of the Senate and House, as is required immediately if an exception to these provisions is made.

I believe this is a good amendment. I think it is a step in the right direction. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and other Senators for the valiant effort which has been made over the past 2 years. I recall that a year ago, when this amendment was adopted, it went to the House, and to my way of thinking its mandatory provisions were completely nullified. It came back watered down.

I appreciate very much the work of the conferees. When they made an exception this time they gave this amendment full consideration. I believe that with the proper administration, the addition of the qualifications which must be met in order to obtain aid will be helpful. I believe that I can say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that his work has paid off. The work of those who have been interested in prohibiting the sale of strategic materials to the enemy through satellite countries is showing results. I hope that we may be able to stop the damnable traffic of furnishing materials to the enemy with which to kill American boys.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I merely wish to say that whatever the Senator from Missouri has done in the matter has been done with the assistance and cooperation of the Senator from Nebraska and a number of other Senators. The Senator from Nebraska has been too modest in what he has said, in failing to refer to his own efficient efforts.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the Senator from Nebraska does not feel that I am against this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the amendment is very fine. I merely wish to say that as a result of past experiences on several occasions, the genius and ingenuity of certain administrative departments in avoiding the clear mandates of the law laid down by Congress place me in the position of saying that while I am for this amendment, I shall await with interest its implementation by the departments which we charge with carrying it out.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not construe the Senator's observations as being in opposition to the amendment. I may say that I am just as apprehensive as is the Senator from Iowa about the administration not only of this amendment, but of other provisions of law which are vital in our foreign policy. All I am saying is that, so far as the Congress is concerned, and especially the Senate, I think we have done a good job legislatively by providing machinery whereby, if the law is fairly and honorably administered, ECA aid can be cut off in the case of countries which continue to furnish materials to our enemies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, has the conference report been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to take this occasion to thank my friend, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], for his kindness in yielding at this time.

TRADE WITH RUSSIA EXPOSED LONG AGO

Mr. MALONE. Before returning to the subject of the Trade Agreements Act, I want to say a few words about the Kem amendment on the conference report.

Mr. President, on March 4 and 5, 1948, the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD a trade treaty between England and Russia. The treaty is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is available to everyone. The first item in it was 1,100 locomotives.

It also covered 50-kilowatt mobile Diesel electric generators; steam power turbine stations; 500-kilowatt ball mills for copper ore grinding; and many other items. Practically every item could be used to arm Russia. These items were being shipped directly to Russia under a trade treaty.

ENGLAND NOT ONLY OFFENDER

England was not the only offender. The junior Senator from Nevada thought he would shock the Senate by placing in the RECORD a list of the trade treaties which the 16 countries which later became Marshall plan countries had at that moment with Russia and the iron-curtain countries.

Everything necessary to arm Russia for a third world war was being shipped. She was receiving materials necessary to enable her to consolidate her gains in the iron-curtain countries.

EIGHTY-EIGHT TRADE TREATIES

The following year, in 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD a list of 88 trade treaties, many of them made during the year following the initial passage of the Marshall plan, later known as the ECA.

All of the trade information was known to the Senate then, just as it is now. It is no secret, and never has been a secret.

Last year the junior Senator from Nevada offered an amendment to the ECA bill which would have prevented the very thing which now arouses so much disgust, but the Senate voted it down.

NOT ONLY TRADE BUT ALSO NONAGGRESSION PACTS EXPOSED

On March 30 or 31 of 1949 the junior Senator from Nevada not only placed in the RECORD a list of 88 trade treaties which were made by the Marshall plan countries during the time they were receiving our direct aid, but he also placed in the RECORD two military and economic pacts made separately by England and France with Russia. Those pacts have 12 or 15 years to run at this date, and no nation which is a party to any of the agreements or pacts has made any move to cancel them.

PACTS READ LIKE THE ATLANTIC PACT

Mr. President, I wish to read a few paragraphs from the treaties, one of which was signed in 1942. The first one was signed by Anthony Eden, on behalf of England, and by Vyacheslav Molotov, on behalf of the Soviet Union. The

other treaty was made between the Soviet Union and France. Article VI of the treaty between England and the Soviet Union reads:

The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Article VII reads:

Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

The other treaty, signed by Molotov, on behalf of Russia, and by Georges Bidault was signed in 1944.

Article V provides:

The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties.

Article VI reads:

The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

ENGLAND, FRANCE LIVING UP TO THE PACT

Mr. President, they have been living up to what they agreed to do in the economic field. Those treaties are still in full force and effect. Perhaps a resolution would be in order either to have the two economic military pacts canceled, or to have the Atlantic Pact canceled. I suppose the Senate will get around to doing it in about 2 or 3 years. Just as we are doing today.

THE WEST IS STILL ARMING RUSSIA

In 1950 the junior Senator from Nevada inserted a list of 95 recent trade treaties between the ECA countries and the Soviet satellites and the U. S. S. R. Many of the old treaties were renewed, and most of the treaties are still in effect. It is not necessary to recall that the junior Senator from Nevada was on his feet time after time talking about trade going from Hong Kong and from Singapore to Communist China. The junior Senator from Nevada was in Singapore in 1948. Shiploads of tin, rubber, and other materials were going to Communist China at that time. They are still going there, or until very very recently.

Once in awhile a ship is picked up. I hope all ships are being stopped, but I doubt it. In fact I am informed that vital material is still going into Red China.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE PACT WITH RUSSIA

On March 30, 31, 1949, I said, in the ECA debate with Senator FORREST C. DONNELL:

Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Missouri, I say that not only is there a plain conflict between the pact and that trade agreement, but a similar pact has been made between France and Russia, and still is in effect.

Furthermore, there is a plain conflict between every one of the trade treaties made by the 15 Marshall-plan countries with the countries behind the iron curtain, for we furnish everything they could possibly want to use if they were to go to war against the United States today.

KOREA SHOWS THE RESULTS OF OUR ARMING RUSSIA

Mr. President, the Senate had the facts at that time just as it has them today. To digress from the RECORD of March 30 and March 31 of 1949 for a minute: Perhaps 60 percent of the material which is now thrown against our boys in Korea was furnished and paid for by the taxpayers of America, by the fathers of the boys who are in Korea.

That fact has been known to the Senate for 3 years. Russia and her satellites now have the material with which to go to war with us. That material, Mr. President, was furnished by us.

ARMED THE JAPS IN 1937–38

I quote further from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I recall the situation on the Pacific Coast in 1937, 1938, and 1939. I live at Reno, Nev., 240 miles from the Pacific coast. In those days the United States allowed oil and scrap iron to be sent from the United States to Japan. That was 5 years before Pearl Harbor; and even at that time every veterans' organization was opposed to those shipments.

SENATE APPROVED WITH FULL KNOWLEDGE

They have been opposed to the shipments that have been made in the last 3 years, too, which were paid for by the United States, with the approval of the Senate.

Practically everyone in the United States spoke against those shipments and complained about them—at least, everyone who had any gumption at all did. But did the administration do anything about that? Oh, no. The administration permitted the scrap iron and oil to be continued to be sent to Japan almost up to the time of Pearl Harbor, and then following Pearl Harbor sent our boys out in the Pacific to catch the steel coming back out of Japanese guns with their bare hands.

Mr. President, that is what we are dong in Korea. That is what we will be doing everywhere in the world when there is a likelihood of war with Russia or her satellites.

I continue reading:

Mr. President, that experience indicates what will happen to the steel, the locomotives, and the other manufactured articles and equipment which these nations are sending to Russia now, if we have trouble with Russia.

Mr. President, that was 3 years ago. We are continuing the quote:

YOUNG MEN TO EUROPE

Mr. President, if we continue to make such shipments and if we continue with these pacts and agreements—each one supposed to be a cure-all—I predict that it will not be long before we shall be sending our young people abroad to catch, with their bare hands again, the bullets and shells which will have been manufactured from the equipment and supplies we send abroad; and they will be the sons and daughters of the veterans of other wars, just as our young people who fought in the Second World War were the sons and daughters of veterans of the First World War. Of course, Mr. President, some of the Members of the Senate are themselves veterans of the Second World War.

Mr. President, that was in March 1949.

NATIONS STILL ON DOLE

I say to the Senator from Missouri and to the Senator from Massachusetts that, in my opinion, the Senate does not have the moral right to promote such agreements and keep the 16 Marshall-plan nations on the dole, when today they are sending the munitions of war and the facilities for arming Russia, to enable her to fight us in a third world war.

We knew it then, and we know it now. The amendment which was tacked to the supplemental appropriations bill refers to strategic materials. What are strategic materials? They are shirt buttons, rubber tires, textiles, or anything that can be used in a civilian or war economy. It is necessary to feed an army, and it is necessary to equip it.

THIS AMENDMENT WILL BE EVADED

Mr. President, you will find that the countries will be dodging the issue presented by this amendment by the mere reasoning that the material is something that cannot be shot out of a gun. In other words, it must be an article that can be used directly for war, according to the reasoning of nations anxious to trade with Russia. It must be steel, ball bearings, or munitions.

CHINA IS NOT COMPLETELY LOST IF WE ACT NOW

Mr. President, if we put a complete embargo on Communist China, she will come back to the Nationists in a very reasonable time. Even now, after abandoning her for 2 years, if Russia cannot furnish China with what it takes to enable her to get along better than she did before, she will lose it. The Russians must be in a position to say to China: "Look what we are doing for you. We are getting you the materials you need from Singapore, Hong Kong, and other ports."

That is the way Russian has held its satellite nations for the last 5 years. She has been able to get materials for Communist China from the so-called western nations.

If we had had an embargo on Russia and her satellites—and I mean a real embargo, not merely an embargo on strategic material—4 years ago, there would be no satellite nations today.

PROPOSAL TO TAX THE SALARIES OF THE PRESIDENT, THE VICE PRESIDENT, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on Friday, May 18, 1951, President Truman spoke before the National Conference on Citizenship at the Statler Hotel here in Washington, at which time he called the attention of the country to the grave danger of inflation.

In his speech, according to the press, President Truman showed some of his old 1948 fire, by launching out against what he described as "special interest fellows"; and he followed that by advising the American people to begin taking a greater interest in their Government.

President Truman did not elaborate as to whom he meant when he referred to the "special interest fellows," but I presume he had reference to the General Vaughans, the Maragons and the other 5-percenters hanging around the White House.

But the one part of President Truman's speech which impressed me in particular was a statement which he made while speaking on the inflationary threat, at which time he called attention to the selfishness of certain people how they were willing to have everybody except themselves make sacrifices.

To emphasize this point, the President is quoted as saying:

Everybody says prices must be held down, but you must hold down everybody's prices but mine. Everybody else must take a cut, but be careful, don't touch mine.

On January 11, 1951, following President Truman's request for additional taxes amounting to $10,000,000,000, I introduced Senate bill 357, the purpose of which was to repeal the special tax exemptions now being enjoyed by the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of Congress on the basis that the officials of the Government should set the example in making sacrifices. This bill was re-introduced on April 9, 1951, with 34 other Senators appearing as cosponsors.

On January 25, 1951, I directed a letter to the President, asking for his support of this bill.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of that letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1951.

The PRESIDENT of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On January 11, 1951, I introduced S. 357, a copy of which is attached. The purpose of this bill is to repeal the special tax exemption which was extended by Congress to you as President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Members of Congress.

I have always felt that the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress should be adequately paid; however, I believe Congress made a serious mistake when it adopted the principle that a portion of their salaries be in the form of a special tax exemption. Our country was established on the sound principle that we would extend to the ruling class no benefits which were not extended to every American citizen.

Today with our country in the midst of a war and at a time when we are going to be compelled to place an additional load upon the already overburdened American taxpayers, I think that the greatest contribution that you as President and that we as Members of Congress could make to their morale and to the war effort in general would be to set the example by repealing this special exemption, thereby subjecting ourselves to the same rate of taxation as is applicable to all other American citizens.

It was in this spirit that I introduced S. 357, and I would very much appreciate having your support in this proposal. I feel confident that your endorsement would receive the enthusiastic commendation of every American citizen.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the fact that the President is allergic to letter writing accounts, I suppose, for the fact that I have not received a reply to this letter. However, in the absence of any direct reply, I presume that his statement of last Friday reflects his position on this bill—when he said:

Everybody else must take a cut, but be careful, don't touch mine.

ASSERTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, throughout my years in the Senate, I have sought to preserve the legislative prerogatives of the United States Congress. I have been concerned at the continuous whittling away of our powers, an insidious process which has been going on since 1933.

In the course of the present joint hearings of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, I have tried to get our committee to exercise their lawful powers.

18–8 VOTE WAS BAD PRECEDENT

For that reason, I was deeply disturbed by the very harmful precedent which was established when the committee by a vote of 18 to 8 last Thursday turned down my appeal to require General Bradley to give us the full facts as to the actual conversations in the White House which preceded General MacArthur's dismissal. Mr. President, I respect the convictions of my 18 colleagues in the opposition and I respect their complete integrity, just as I respect my 7 associates who held with me. I respect the right of those 18 Senators to differ with me, but I caution them that they are contributing to the process of the whittling away of Congress' powers. Surely, our Republican forces, in particular, which have so steadfastly fought against the undermining of the legislative branch, will see eventually, and should see right now, that it was most unfortunate that some members of the GOP failed to fight for this historic cause—the independent sovereignty of our branch.

When a duly authorized committee of the United States Congress cannot request and secure the information it wants, then the question naturally arises, "Why have a committee at all?" It is now clear that these two committees will not obtain those facts.

I HOPE WHITEWASH WON'T RESULT

It is my earnest hope that this joint hearing will not end up in such a condition as to require the American people to say that it was just another whitewash and washout.

I was quoted as saying the other day that the joint hearing was a whitewash or a washout. I did not say that, however. I said I hoped we would be able to get sufficient facts, and would not, in fact, be held back, so that the conclusion of honest men everywhere would be that the hearing was a whitewash.

At this time I cannot help but think of the argument made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who said there is no immunity, and then presented the argument of privilege. I shall not argue that question. However, as I have read the articles appearing in the press, it is very clear that those who wrote the articles have not read the argument of the Senator from Georgia on that subject, nor have they told the facts to the American people.

Mr. President, the fact is that until that time the President had not once indicated to the committee nor has he since done so, that he believed the conversations to be privileged. It was General Bradley who said he had not even talked with the President on the subject of whether those conversations were confidential or privileged. That fact is shown by the record. The law cannot be fitted to the facts until we obtain the facts.

So, Mr. President, the real question is whether General Bradley has a right to claim that those conversations are privileged. Even if he has a right to make that claim, is it not the obligation of the President to disclose the facts? This issue does not go to the question of public interest, but goes to the matter of whether the people of the United States should be informed of the facts by those who know them. Should those who know the facts be required to inform the people of America why the decision to replace General MacArthur was reached?

Mr. President, we already have had three answers to that question; I understand that another one was given today. I was not in the Senate Chamber earlier today, for I was on my way to Washington, returning from Wisconsin.

So, Mr. President, I have stated that it is my sincere hope that the joint hearing now under way will not end in a condition which will require the American people to say that the hearing was merely another whitewash and washout.

On Friday afternoon, I sent to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] a letter expressing this fervent hope.

On Sunday morning, I released a statement indicating that I, for one, felt that it might contribute to the national well-being if President Truman were to be asked to testify before our committee. Why should not the President do so? In the White House conversations in regard to General MacArthur was there something really confidential, about which the people should not know? If there was, let the President say so. However, he has not made such a statement, other than to do so, I understand, inferentially to the press.

If the President does not wish to testify before these committees, we cannot compel him to do so. However, there have been hundreds of instances in which Presidents have communicated with congressional committees and have sent to them documents which they have requested. That was my desire in the present case. I had no desire to engage in cheap politics. The two committees are constituted of honorable men. Never in my 12 year of service in the Senate has a suggestion been made that my conduct has been based on cheap politics. I say that these committees and the Senate itself are entitled to the facts in this matter. That is all we wish to have.

relinquished by our present titular head of Broome County, it is going to be draped over the shoulders of Mr. Kress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 58, on May 17, I am recorded as being absent. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in signing the resolution recommending that Secretary of State Acheson be replaced immediately by a new Secretary in whom the people can have confidence, I wish to make it quite clear that, in my opinion, no question is raised about either Secretary Acheson's integrity or devotion to duty. In many respects he is a man of great ability.

However, events have shown him to have been consistently and tragically wrong in his far-eastern policy. His policy has resulted in a great people, the Chinese, being subjected to the tyrannical and godless slavery of communism fostered by imperialistic Russia. It has resulted in this Nation becoming engaged in a bloody war wherein we have suffered more casualties in less than 1 year than in an entire year of World War II.

And looking at it from the other side, we are engaged in a horrible strategy named Operation Killer, the object being to kill so many Chinese that they will quit. This is our peace plan.

Some say that Mr. Acheson was merely carrying out the policy set by President Truman. Perhaps that is so, but unlike the British system of government, we do not change the head of our Government when the people have lost confidence in a basic policy. We need to regain the confidence of the people in order to establish national unity. Mr. Acheson has become the symbol of our ill-fated eastern policy and he should go.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an item from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

FABULOUS CHERRY COUNTY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Census has just released its report on Cherry County, Nebr., showing that it still retains its place as the leading county in the United States in the production of cattle. The 1950 Census tabulations show that between 1945 and 1950 Cherry County increased the number of cattle on its ranches from 237,888 to 268,456. During 1949 Cherry County ranches sold 100,000 cattle and calves for more than $13,000,000. There are more cattle in Cherry County than people in the city of Omaha, the Nebraska metropolis and almost as many as the total population of the Omaha metropolitan area. Under the headline "Fabulous Cherry County," the Grand Island (Nebr.) Daily Independent editorialized:

Cherry County, Nebr., has 5,982 square miles of area. It is larger than the combined States of Delaware and Rhode Island. It is larger than the State of Connecticut. Its area exceeds that of Buffalo, Hall, Merrick, Hamilton, Howard, Sherman, York, Polk, Greeley, and Valley Counties combined.

The census of 1950 shows that Cherry County had on its ranches last year 268,456 cattle, compared with 237,888 5 years before. Nearly 100,000 cattle and calves were sold during the year for more than $13,000,000. No other county in the United States—including Texas, suh—can equal this record.

Farms and ranches in Cherry County are on a par with the gargantuan nature of the county. The average size of each farm last year was 4,084.5 acres, and the average value of the 866 farms in the county was $61,443, more than double its value 5 years before.

A veritable John Bunyan among counties is Cherry.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of May 17, 1951, at page 5601, in a colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who was handling the agricultural appropriation bill on that day, the statement is made:

Here we are making a comparison between United States citizens and citizens of Territories.

I ask unanimous consent that the words "and citizens of Territories" be stricken out because there is no difference between United States citizens anywhere.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. YORTY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD].

ESTATE OF ROBERT D. JOHNSON

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 232) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to the estate of Robert D. Johnson, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Robert D. Johnson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an address made on May 18 by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The address is as follows:)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 18, 1951

Mr. Chairman, General Marshall, distinguished guests—the Armed Forces of Japan and Korea, and our gallant allies who are alongside our Armed Forces in Korea, I want to impress upon you, on this second anniversary of Armed Forces Day, that we are in the midst of one of the greatest crises this country has ever faced.

You fighting men, and you fighting allies in Korea and Japan, are holding the line, while we endeavor at this end to attain a peaceful settlement of the situation in the world.

For five and a half long years, we have been striving to attain a peace in the world that would be lasting.

We did not institute aggression in Korea. We not institute aggression in Greece. We did not institute aggression in Berlin.

We do not want war. We want peace.

The United Nations was organized for the purpose of enforcing the peace in the world.

When the North Koreans and Chinese began their aggressive attacks and marched into South Korea, a Republic which had been set up by the United Nations and under their aegis, it was necessary that the peace-loving nations of the world enforce that peace, and stop the aggression.

And that is exactly what we are trying to do.

When we sit here tonight, in our evening clothes, partaking of food on white tablecloths, and enjoying ourselves in other ways, bear in mind that there are men fighting and dying in an endeavor to reach that peace for which we have been striving since World War II ceased.

Remember that these men are baring their breasts for liberty and unity in the world.

It is necessary that the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful free nation in the world—and I say that not in a bragging way, but because it happens to be the truth—the people of the United States have assumed the responsibility which no other nation in the history of the world has assumed.

We are the leaders of the free peoples of the world. It is necessary that we display that leadership, and we must display it here at home by a unity so that those young men on the battlefields of Korea shall not die in vain, so that those young men in Korea may accomplish the purpose for which they are fighting.

It is necessary that you here at home remember that this is a world crisis, that this crisis must be met through the leadership of the United States of America, and it is up to you people here at home to see that that is accomplished.

In order to accomplish that purpose, you must quit your bickering here at home, you must quit playing petty politics, you must remember that there are certain things that have to be done here at home, if we are going to accomplish the purpose.

We are fighting for time. The young men in Korea and Japan are fighting for time—for us.

There is always an emphasis on the casualties in Korea. Of course, when there is fighting, there are casualties.

But did it ever occur to you that if this necessity with which we are faced is not met, that the casualties in Korea will be one small drop in the bucket from one of those horrible bombs of which we talk so much.

Think—think—think what a responsibility your President faces in a situation of this kind. If you would think, and think clearly on this subject, you would get behind me and help me to win this peace.

And that is what I am asking you to do.

And that is what our Armed Forces are in the field to do.

It is up to you.

We have the greatest defense organization in the history of the world. There has never been a defense organization headed by so many distinguished men, who know what they are doing, from experience. There has never been a Government of the United States as united as the executive branch of this Government of ours is now.

It is up to the other branches of the Government to see that we will accomplish the purpose which God intended us to accomplish, and that is to lead the world to peace.

I hope every one of you will go home and get down on your knees and pray for guidance to do the right thing, that these young men who are now fighting on the battlefields of Korea shall not die in vain.

It is up to you.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 484)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 27, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 21, 23, 30, 31, 32 and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, 25, 28, 33, and 34.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
GUY CORDON (with reservations),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER II

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 1—Senate: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—Payment to children of deceased Senator: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3—Contingent expenses of the Senate: Appropriates $17,878 for furniture and repairs as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5—Payments to widows of deceased Representatives: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—Senate Restaurants: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7—Government Printing Office: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER III

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 8—Federal Bureau of Investigation: Appropriates $5,872,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,147,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9—Federal Prison System: Appropriates $449,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Civil Aeronautics Board: Deletes the House proposal of an additional amount of $25,000 for "Salaries and expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 11—Coast Guard: Strikes out House provision to appropriate an additional $1,000,000 for "Operating expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 12—Postal operations: Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 13—Office of Education: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 14—Control of forest pests: Strikes out the Senate proposal to appropriate $345,000 for "Forest Pest Control Act," as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—Forest Service: Appropriates $3,300,000 for "Forest development roads and trails", instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed is to provide $2,500,000 for construction and $800,000 for repairs.

CHAPTER VII

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 16—Bureau of Mines: Strikes out Senate proposal to appropriate $350,000 for construction, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—Territories and island possessions: Appropriates $4,000,000 for "Construction, Alaska Railroad", as proposed by the House instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that if necessary up to $500,000 of funds already appropriated may be utilized for constructing shops at Anchorage, it being understood that any such additional funds will not be replaced by new appropriations.

CHAPTER VIII

Independent offices

Amendment No. 18—Office of the Housing Expediter: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 19—Vessel operations, revolving fund: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20—Vessel operations, revolving fund: Deletes Senate language as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER IX

Civil Functions, Department of the Army

Amendment No. 21: Changes title as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

International children's welfare work

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $5,750,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed in approving this figure that the contribution of the United States to this program shall not exceed one-third of total funds contributed to the program by all countries.

CHAPTER XI

Expenses of defense production

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $27,331,895 as proposed by the Senate instead of $33,029,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24: Strikes out Senate language for transfer of funds as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Civil Defense Administration

Amendment No. 25: Deletes Senate language for inclusion of security guard services as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27—Operations: Appropriates $1,750,000 of which $110,000 shall be available for civil defense communication systems as proposed by the House instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Federal contributions: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—Civil defense procurement fund: Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Civil defense emergency fund: Strikes out House proposal to appropriate $100,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XII

Claims for damages, audited claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32: Appropriates $3,103,881 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,999,045 as proposed by the House and include the claims as set forth in Senate Document No. 25.

CHAPTER XIII

General provisions

Amendment No. 33, relating to wages paid those who advocate or belong to organizations which advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34, relating to funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35: Changes section number as proposed by the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the conference on this bill was one of the most harmonious I have attended and the report we submit is I believe agreeable to all Members on both sides of the aisle, so far as the House conferees are concerned, and also to all managers on the part of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. In other words, we have reached a practically unanimous agreement.

There are, of course, certain amendments in technical disagreement which are brought back under the rules of the House, but they will be submitted in accordance with agreements unanimously reached by all managers of the two Houses. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we have effected exceptional economies in drafting the conference report and all advocates of reduction in nondefense expenditures will find the figures reported by the conferees decidedly interesting. For the sake of brevity I submit them in tabular form, as follows:

Budget estimates considered in the House	$843,463,579
House committee recommendation	478,586,368
Passed House	473,165,368
Budget estimates considered in Senate	896,116,293
Senate committee recommendation	430,102,477
Passed Senate	431,127,477
Conference agreement	364,932,477
Budget estimate considered in Senate	896,116,293
Conference agreement	—364,932,477
Reduction from total budget estimate	531,183,816

As will be noted, we have agreed in conference to a figure materially lower than that passed by either House. It is an unprecedented decrease in the estimates submitted.

Mr. Speaker, if no one desires to be heard, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House consider en bloc those amendments that are in technical disagreement, on which the House managers will move to recede and concur. There are seven of them, Senate amendments Nos. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 33. These are mere formalities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 23, insert:

"For payment to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., son, and Barbara Vandenberg Bailey and Elizabeth Vandenberg Pfeiffer, daughters, of Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 7, insert:

"For payment to Vera D. Buchanan, widow of Frank Buchanan, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 10, insert:

"For payment to Maude F. Kee, widow of John Kee, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 6, insert:

"SENATE RESTAURANTS

"For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor, and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to provide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Building, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, $30,000."

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 5, line 17, insert:

"GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

"WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

"For an additional amount for 'Working capital and congressional printing and binding,' $1,200,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register in accordance with the act approved July 26, 1935 (44 U. S. C. 301–310), is increased from '$475,000' to '$675,000'."

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 12, line 13, insert:

"FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Grants for surveys and school construction

"For an additional amount for 'Grants for surveys and school construction,' to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities: *Provided*, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under this head, shall also be available to enable the Commisisoner to provide school facilities pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815)."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 25, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for

sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 15, line 8, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

"Salaries and Expenses

"The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, oly for the payment of terminal leave is changed from '$2,000,000' to $1,000,000.'

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum of "$1,000,000," named in said amendment, insert "$1,750,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] whose subcommittee handled this matter.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, some explanation should be made to the House with reference to this amendment because we are going to hear something about it in the next few days. To go back a little while, for the fiscal year 1951 the Congress has appropriated to the Housing Expediter a total of $13,415,500 to operate until March 31 of this year, and in giving the Expediter that sum the budget estimates were substantially reduced. On the 23rd of March of this year rent control was extended until June 30th of this year; in other words, 3 months. The Housing Expediter does not have enough money to operate during these remaining months. A Budget estimate was sent to the Senate for $1,000,000, not new money, but to earmark and use $1,000,000 of funds heretofore limited to use for terminal leave only. Unfortunately the Housing Expediter did not come to the House or any of its subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, and therefore we went into the conference with the other body without full information on the subject. We gave him, not the $1,000,000 requested, but $250,000; and frankly, it is not enough for him to do the job. He has 2,500 employees, and I was advised only about 10 minutes ago that he is going to have to release more than 1,000 employees. My suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], is simply this, that by letter or some other method you advise the Housing Expediter to carry on his duties. It was not the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to legislate him out of business, and within the next few days when the fourth supplemental appropriation bill comes along, we can make up that deficiency which, I might say, we erroneously cut off. He is entitled to the $1,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 17, strike out, beginning on line 21 down to and including line 4 on page 19, as follows:

"No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by the said amendment insert:

"No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for maritime activities, by this or any other act shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor (except in cases where section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable) is computed in accordance with subsection 902 (a) of said act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I simply would like to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri if he would be good enough to explain the difference between the language which he is now suggesting and the language which was stricken.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], whose subcommittee handled this item.

Mr. THOMAS. The language here in substittue for the original House language, I might say, is far less drastic and, I am sure, it will please the gentleman from Maine. The language in the original House bill gave to the operators, in case the ship was requisitioned and sunk, only the purchase price minus depreciation. This works out a formula in keeping wtih the Ship Sales Act of 1936, with which the gentleman is familiar, embodying the principles laid down in that act in sections 802 and 902 (a).

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 21, strike out all of lines 16 to 23, inclusive, as follows: *"Provided further*, That the appropriation 'Expenses of Defense Production' may be increased by transfer of not to exceed $1,834,000 of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 to the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and the General Services Administration for the purpose of carrying out the duties and responsibilities assigned to these agencies under provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert "and transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporation as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realine its regular programs."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: On page 22, line 19, strike out the remainder of the page and down to and including line 5 on page 23, as follows:

"Federal contributions

"For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by

the States to match contributions hereunder."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Federal contributions

"For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $25,000,000, to be equally matched with State funds, of which $20,000,000 shall be for medical supplies and equipment and $5,000,000 for training and education, to remain available to June 30, 1952."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 27, line 26, insert the following:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration any article or commodity of the nature or class described.

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation may be used in the manufacture of arms, armament or military matériel, or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation any article or commodity of the nature or class described: *Provided,* That after the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act and prior to the termination of the period heretofore referred to no country shall be eligible for economic or financial assistance under any such act unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armaments, military matériel, articles, or commodities, which are subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided further,* That such certification shall not relieve the Administrator for Economic Cooperation or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided further,* That exceptions to these provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States: *Provided further,* That the National Security Council shall immediately report any exception made with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the National Security Council shall at least once each quarter review all exceptions made previously and shall report its determinations to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which an exception is made.'

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the need for this provision has been largely disposed of, and is now largely historical, due to the fact that the nations concerned have already voluntarily restricted their nationals and interdicted the flow of such goods to a point where at this time fully 95 percent or more of the goods embargoed by the United States Government are no longer in commerce with unfriendly nations. In a very short time the embargo will be 100 percent complete.

However, this amendment would be effective if by chance occasion for its use should rise.

In writing the provision our endeavor was to make it as flexible as possible so as to accommodate its invocation and interpretation to any need which may develop. It is self-policing. Each nation submits its own certificate. Should it ever become necessary to invoke the law in any respect, a liberal interpretation of its provisions will adequately meet any situation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE FUND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may proceed for 5 minutes to discuss the International Children's Welfare Fund, and the language of amendment No. 22 in the conference report which was just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask a question in connection with the last amendment? Do I understand the intention is that there will be such flexibility as will meet the requirements of the national interest of our country as the occasion may demand?

Mr. CANNON. That was our purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarifying in my own mind and in the minds of several of our colleagues who have raised a similar inquiry, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if it is not true that the language of amendment No. 22, chapter 10, in their conference report dealing with the International Children's Welfare work conflicts with or attempts to modify the organic act dealing with the International Children's Fund. In any opinion the conference report language in effect changes the terms of the original authorization, which is Public Law 535, since it sets a limitation upon the conditions under which the President can make contributions for the International Children's Welfare work. In my opinion this contradicts the authority vested in the President by the original authorization, the original organic act, which states:

The President may make contributions to the United Nations for international children's welfare work in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the interest of the United States.

In the appropriation bill there is no reference to any qualification or additional limitations. In this conference report the conference committee states:

That the United States contribution shall not exceed one-third of the funds made available to the fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report says, "The conferees are agreed"—that is not the House of Representatives or the Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is my understanding. It is the conferees who are agreed. The original legislation and appropriation, the third supplemental appropriation bill, which was passed by this

body, carried no such limitation and no such limitation was discussed or debated on the floor. May I have some comment from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on this, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House bill provided $5,000,000 for this item. The other body increased the item to $7,500,000. In conference we agreed upon a compromise of $5,750,000. It has been the objective and the goal of our Government from the beginning that we would in all international assessments restrict our contribution to one-third of the amount provided. Our idea was that in all such contributions the United States Government should provide one-third, and the remaining members of the United Nations should provide two-thirds.

The item before us is the only activity to which we have contributed a disproportionate amount. Up to this time we have been paying 72 percent, and the rest of the participants combined have been paying 28 percent.

However, in all other activities the contribution of the United States Government has been from 26 percent, as for example on food and agriculture, and the remainder of the contributors 74 percent. The highest contribution we make is the 39 percent contribution to the general fund. So, for none of the activities, except this one item, do we contribute more than 39 percent, and on most of them an average of less than 30 percent.

Accordingly, in keeping with the objective of the United States Government to pay one-third, we have in this paragraph provided additional money, but in the report the conferees expressed the opinion that in all contributions the United States Government should pay one-third and our allies two-thirds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. It is intended by the committee that this organization can spend $5,750,000, however.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly, every cent of it. We, however express the conviction that it should be allocated on a ratio of one-third and two-thirds, one-third by the United States and two-thirds by the remaining contributors.

Mr. STEFAN. You are providing $5,750,000 and telling their committee they can expend that.

Mr. CANNON. Exactly. The gentleman's statement is accurate in every respect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has expired.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. The point of view expressed by the chairman is interesting, but the point I raise this afternoon is this: If there is a wish to provide for a change in the organic act, any limitation thereon should be made by the proper authorizing committee and by the Members themselves in the organic bill by amending the same. The attempt should not be made to amend it by a statement made upon the part of the conferees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think what the gentleman has in mind is that the language in the conference report might represent the views of the conferees but certainly does not represent the intent of the Congress. Is that right?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I would like also to have clarification of the last phrase in the language in the conference report. It says that our contribution "shall not exceed one-third of the total funds contributed to the program by all countries." Does that include only contributions made by the governments of all countries? Or does that language include contributions that may be made by private persons or philanthropic organizations in various countries? That is, when the organization figures up the two-thirds from other countries to match our one-third, can it figure in contributions of private agencies, such as women's groups, which get together to raise money for children, as they have been doing?

A second question is this: Heretofore if the French Government contributed some money or supplies to the general fund that is to be used for children in Austria or Yugoslavia or some other country, that could be considered as a matching contribution. But if the money were contributed by the French Government for children's welfare within France it was not considered as a matching contribution. I think there ought to be clarification of what is meant by "total funds contributed by all countries." First, does it include all contributions of all governments even for children's relief and welfare within their own countries? And, second, does it include contributions by private organizations?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes in order to clear this matter up.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] points out very clearly now the questions that arise. I do not have the answers to the questions; all that is available is merely the statement in the report of the conferees, and this is without any clarification or elaboration. There are many questions such as these which should be discussed in a proper committee and then on the floor. Should there be any wish to change the formula that is the place to take it up.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. CANNON. None of the questions submitted here are pertinent to the situation. This bill does not change in any way the system of distribution or the control of that system; the only thing the bill does is to provide an appropriation of $5,750,000 for the International Children's Welfare work.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, this language is more a direction as to the future than a limitation upon the present appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. The language in the conference report is necessarily a recommendation, not a mandate, but I trust its significance will not be overlooked by all concerned.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CONDITIONAL RELEASE OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2924) to amend section 4164 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, I have in the past asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I have however since the bill was last called, discussed the matter in detail with the United States Department of Justice prison officials, and on the basis of their reports and further information I am convinced that it is desirable legislation. I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4164 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 4164. Released prisoner as parolee

"A prisoner having served the term or terms for which he shall have been sentenced after June 29, 1932, less good-time deductions, shall be unconditionally released if there remain less than 180 days to serve. If there remain 180 days or over to be served he shall upon release be treated as if released on parole, and shall be subject to all provisions of law relating to the parole of United States prisoners until the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced less 180 days.

"This section shall not prevent delivery of a prisoner to the authorities of any State otherwise entitled to his custody."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That section 4164 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Public Law 45 - 82d Congress
Chapter 121 - 1st Session
H. R. 3587

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of Revenues of the District of Columbia)

General Administration

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Office of the Corporation Counsel", $5,000; and the limitation under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951 on the amount available for the settlement of claims is increased from "$7,000" to "$12,000".

Fiscal Service

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

For additional amounts for "Collector's Office", fiscal year 1949, $653,568, and fiscal year 1951, $144,700.

Courts

UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "United States courts", $265,443.

Public Welfare

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For additional amounts for "Saint Elizabeths Hospital", fiscal year 1949, $13,704, and fiscal year 1950, $22,604.

Settlement of Claims and Suits

For an additional amount for the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (46 Stat. 500), $7,493.

Judgments

For the payment of final judgments rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in House Document Numbered 67 (82d Congress), together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 per centum per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment, $5,580.

Audited Claims

For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under

appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1948 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in House Document Numbered 67 (82d Congress), $4,648.

CHAPTER II

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate

For payment to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Junior, son, and Barbara Vandenberg Bailey and Elizabeth Vandenberg Pfeiffer, daughters, of Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $12,500.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

For an additional amount for "Furniture and repairs", $17,878.

House of Representatives

For payment to Vera D. Buchanan, widow of Frank Buchanan, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500.

For payment to Maude F. Kee, widow of John Kee, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, $12,500.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", $1,000, to remain available until expended.

Architect of the Capitol

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For an additional amount, for liquidation of contract authority, for the House and Senate improvements authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the Acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472), Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1027), and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, $268,000, of which $168,000 shall be available for the House improvements and $100,000 for the Senate improvements.

For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings", $3,000.

Senate Restaurants

For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to provide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Building, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, $30,000.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For an additional amount for "House office buildings", including furniture and furnishings, $21,500.

Government Printing Office

WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For an additional amount for "Working capital and congressional printing and binding", $1,200,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register in accordance with the Act approved July 26, 1935 (44 U. S. C. 301–310), is increased from "$475,000" to "$675,000".

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

American Sections, International Commissions

For an additional amount for "American sections, international commissions", $36,500, which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations"; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available to enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "International information and educational activities", for facilities for radio transmission and reception, and so forth, as authorized in the third proviso under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, $9,533,939, to remain available until expended; and the limitation contained in said proviso is increased from "$41,288,000" to "$50,821,939".

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", $30,000.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $5,872,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for the purchase of seven hundred passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided.

Federal Prison System

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", $449,000.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $139,000.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities", $1,380,000, for replacement of the power and heating plants of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1951, on the cost of completion of the replacement of a power plant at the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia, is repealed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Civil Aeronautics Administration

CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act", $1,464,384, to remain available until June 30, 1953, as follows: Visalia Municipal Airport, Visalia, California, $40,277; Gainesville Municipal Airport, Gainesville, Florida, $9,467; Waycross-Ware County Airport, the city of Waycross and Ware County, Georgia, $55,417; Harding Field, the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $140,650; New Orleans Airport, Orleans Levee District and the Orleans Airport Commission, Louisiana, $257,237; Laurence G. Hanscom Field, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, $91,528; English Field, Amarillo, Texas, $29,590; Rio Grande Valley International Airport, Brownsville, Texas, $384,161; Eaker Airfield, Durant, Oklahoma, $359,580; Jefferson County Airport, Jefferson County, Texas, $40,593; and the Draughon-Miller Municipal Airport, Temple, Texas, $55,884: *Provided*, That no request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952 of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, departmental", $450,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FIELD

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, field", $70,000.

Bureau of Public Roads

TONGASS FOREST HIGHWAYS, ALASKA

For surveys, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authorization granted by section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, $750,000, to remain available until expended.

THE JUDICIARY

Other Courts and Services

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Fees of commissioners", $25,000.

FEES OF JURORS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", $200,000.

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Bureau of the Mint

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $130,000.

Coast Guard

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements", $350,000, to remain available until expended.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

Postal Operations

For an additional amount for "Postal operations", $7,500,000.

Transportation of Mails

For an additional amount for "Transportation of mails", for payment of increased rates to railroad carriers for 1951 and prior fiscal years, in accordance with Interstate Commerce Commission Order of December 4, 1950 (Docket Numbered 9200), $152,000,000.

Field Service, Post Office Department

OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Clerks, First- and Second-Class Post Offices

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Clerks, first- and second-class post offices", $150,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Clerks, third-class post offices, 1947".

OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Railroad transportation and mail messenger service," $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Domestic air mail service, 1948".

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employees' Compensation

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND

For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation fund", $3,000,000.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Office of Education

GRANTS FOR SURVEYS AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and school construction," to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities: *Provided*, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under this head, shall also be available to enable the Commissioner to provide school facilities pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815).

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

For an additional amount for "Forest development roads and trails", $3,300,000, to remain available until expended.

Commodity Credit Corporation

The limitation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$16,350,000" to "$19,100,000".

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Commission of Fine Arts

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $2,000.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $3,650,000, to remain available until expended.

Territories and Island Possessions

CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

For an additional amount for "Construction, Alaska Railroad", $4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VIII

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Service Commission

ANNUITIES, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WIDOWS

For payment of annuities as authorized by the Act of August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465), $204,500.

General Services Administration

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The amount authorized to be transferred from the appropriation granted under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, to the appropriation "Operating expenses", for the reactivation of industrial plants, is increased from "$14,000,000" to "$26,000,000".

EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for emergency alterations and improvements to public buildings under the control of the General Services Administration.

Office of the Housing Expediter

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the payment of terminal leave is changed from "$2,000,000" to "$1,750,000".

Veterans' Administration

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $26,618,000, to remain available until expended.

AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

To enable the Administrator to provide, or assist in providing, automobiles or other conveyances for disabled veterans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950 (Public Law 798), $800,000.

Department of Commerce

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

MARITIME TRAINING

The limitation under the head "Maritime training", United States Maritime Commission, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for administrative personal services and so forth is increased from "$2,477,000" to "$2,532,000".

VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

For working capital for the "Vessel Operations Revolving Fund", which is hereby created for the purpose of carrying out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Commerce, including charter, operation, maintenance, repair, reconditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for shipping services rendered under said Fund shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Fund shall be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities conducted thereunder: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) and 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be applicable in connection with such operations and to seamen employed through general agents as employees of the United States, who may be employed in accordance with customary commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwithstanding the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the employment of persons by the United States: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 per centum of vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this Fund to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as stated therein: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any working funds or of allocation accounts established, subsequent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore and hereafter received from such activities, may be transferred to and consolidated with this Fund, which shall be available for the purposes of such working funds or allocation accounts.

No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for Maritime Activities, by this or any other Act shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor, (except in cases where section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable) is computed in accordance with subsection 902 (a) of said Act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Functions, Department of the Army

THE PANAMA CANAL

CIVIL GOVERNMENT

For an additional amount for "Civil government", $72,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal."

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT REMEDIAL WORKS INVESTIGATION

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until expended, $450,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Flood control, general".

CHAPTER X

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

International Children's Welfare Work

To enable the President, during the fiscal year 1951, to carry out the provisions of title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 209), relating to international children's welfare work, $5,750,000.

CHAPTER XI

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Expenses of Defense Production

For an additional amount for "Expenses of defense production", $27,331,895: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and improvements necessary for the proper use by the Government, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a): *Provided further*, That the appropriation to the President for Emergencies (National Defense) shall be reimbursed from funds contained herein for allocations made therefrom to any agency of the Government for carrying out the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 after March 31, 1951: *Provided further*, That the aggregate of borrowings from the Treasury pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which may be outstanding at any one time is increased from "$600,000,000" to "$1,600,000,000": *Provided further*, That any appropriation to any department, agency, or corporation, in the executive branch of the Government, for salaries and expenses, shall be available for the discharge of responsibilities, relating to the national defense, assigned to such department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law and transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporation as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realign its regular programs.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Federal Civil Defense Administration

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including purchase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; $1,750,000: *Provided*, That $110,000 shall be available for providing civil defense communications systems pursuant to subsection (c) of section 201 of said Act.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $25,000,000, to be equally matched with State funds, of which $20,000,000 shall be for medical supplies and equipment and $5,000,000 for training and education, to remain available to June 30, 1952.

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement fund", which is hereby established for the purpose of financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of materials or organizational equipment for which financial contributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made on a matching basis by subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $5,000,000. Said fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said materials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance, or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

CHAPTER XII

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 25, and House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-Second Congress, $3,103,881, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless

otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

CHAPTER XIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than sixty days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other Act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military materiel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military materiel, or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby

authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation any article or commodity of the nature or class described: *Provided*, That after the 15th day following the date of enactment of this Act and prior to the termination of the period heretofore referred to no country shall be eligible for economic or financial assistance under any such Act unless within thirty days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the 15th day following the date of enactment of this Act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armaments, military materiel, articles, or commodities, which are subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided further*, That such certification shall not relieve the Administrator for Economic Cooperation or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided further*, That exceptions to these provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That the National Security Council shall immediately report any exception made with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the National Security Council shall at least once each quarter review all exceptions made previously and shall report its determinations to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which an exception is made.

(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 1303. This Act may be cited as the "Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951".

Approved June 2, 1951.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1951 O - 84631

468-A
10

3

3540E